

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

JULY 1900.

No. 3.

## Doctrinal Theology.

### CHRISTOLOGY.

(Concluded.)

#### II. THE OFFICE AND WORK OF CHRIST.

##### Christ the Prophet.

A prophet is an official spokesman of God. Thus said the Lord to Moses, "Aaron shall be *thy spokesman* unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee *instead of a mouth*, and thou shalt be to him *instead of God*."<sup>1)</sup> And in this capacity Aaron was a *prophet*. The Lord said unto Moses, "See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be *thy prophet*."<sup>2)</sup> It was not Aaron who of his own accord stepped in to supply the deficiency of which his brother Moses complained;<sup>3)</sup> but by divine appointment he was made a spokesman of God, and thus was he constituted a prophet. *Prophecy came not by the will of man*.<sup>4)</sup> The prophet does not appear in his own name, but comes with a commission from a superior, whose agent or public officer he is in his capacity of a prophet, a spokesman by divine commission, uttering the thoughts and will and very words of him from whom he has his commission.<sup>5)</sup>

1) Exod. 4, 16.

2) Exod. 7, 1.

3) Exod. 4, 10.

4) 2 Pet. 1, 21.

5) Matt. 1, 22. Acts 1, 16; 3, 18. Amos 3, 1. Jer. 1, 2. al.

*I have SENT unto you all MY SERVANTS THE PROPHETS, says God by Jeremiah,<sup>1)</sup> and of those who would not hearken to them he says, This is a nation that obeyeth not THE VOICE OF THE LORD THEIR GOD.<sup>2)</sup>*

But a greater prophet than Moses and Aaron, than Isaiah and Jeremiah, was promised to Israel when the Lord said to Moses, *I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.*<sup>3)</sup> Here the coming prophet is an official spokesman of God, who, under divine commission, raised up by the Lord himself, should utter the words which God would put in his mouth and speak all that God would command him. And *Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren.*<sup>4)</sup> For in Jesus Christ that promise was fulfilled. When the fulness of time was come, *God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days SPOKEN UNTO US BY HIS SON.*<sup>5)</sup> Jesus of Nazareth, the God-man, was *of a truth that prophet that should come into the world.*<sup>6)</sup> Of him the Father himself said, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; HEAR YE HIM.*<sup>7)</sup> Having read the prophecy of Isaiah, *The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach, etc.*<sup>8)</sup> Jesus said, *This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.*<sup>9)</sup> He, the God-man, who according to his divine nature was *from above, and not of this world,*<sup>10)</sup> and at the same time, according to his human nature, the Son of man,<sup>11)</sup> says of himself, *As my Father hath TAUGHT me, I speak these things; and he that SENT me is with me.*<sup>12)</sup> *He that SENT me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him.*<sup>13)</sup> *I have not*

1) Jer. 7, 25.

2) Jer. 7, 27 f.

3) Deut. 18, 18.

4) Acts 3, 22.

5) Hebr. 1, 1 f.

6) John 6, 14.

7) Matt. 17, 5.

8) Is. 61, 1. Cf. Luke 4, 18.

9) Luke 4, 21.

10) John 8, 23.

11) John 8, 28.

12) John 8, 28 f.

13) John 8, 26.

*spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.*<sup>1)</sup> In all these and similar statements Christ describes and exhibits himself as a prophet, a spokesman of God by divine commission.

And this he was not incidentally. He says, *To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth.*<sup>2)</sup> He is himself the truth,<sup>3)</sup> and full of grace and TRUTH.<sup>4)</sup> In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.<sup>5)</sup> He that cometh from heaven is above all, and what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth.<sup>6)</sup> He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.<sup>7)</sup> And hence he says of himself, *We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen.*<sup>8)</sup> As in his sacerdotal office God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, so in his prophetic office God was in Christ and preached the peace he himself established, the reconciliation wrought by himself.<sup>9)</sup> As in his sacerdotal office, in which, being God himself, he is the mediator between God and man, a greater mediator than Moses, the mediator of the old covenant, so in his prophetic office, in which, being God himself, he is the spokesman of God, he is a greater prophet than Moses was, greater also than John, who was more than a prophet,<sup>10)</sup> but not worthy to unloose the shoe's latchet of the prophet of Nazareth.<sup>11)</sup> The law was given by Moses, who had held converse with God on mount Sinai many days.<sup>12)</sup> *But grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, not by inspiration or suggestion, but as by the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father,*<sup>13)</sup> testifying what

1) John 12, 49; cf. v. 50; ch. 14, 10.

2) John 18, 37.

3) John 14, 6.

4) John 1, 14.

5) Col. 2, 3.

6) John 3, 32.

7) John 3, 34.

8) John 3, 11.

9) Eph. 2, 17; cf. v. 22. 2 Cor. 5, 18 f.

10) Matt. 11, 9. Luke 7, 26—28.

11) John 1, 27.

12) John 1, 17. Exod. 19, 20 f.; 24, 15—18.

13) John 1, 18.



he has seen and heard in the eternal counsels of God. Neither according to his humanity only, nor according to his divinity only, but the God-man, Jesus Christ, who is made unto us righteousness in his sacerdotal office, is also of *God made unto us wisdom*<sup>1)</sup> in his prophetic office. In this prophetic office as in his priesthood Christ is *sui generis*. He is not only the greatest of the prophets, but *ὁ προφήτης, the prophet*.<sup>2)</sup> Being a prophet, sent of the Father, he was *approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him*.<sup>3)</sup> In his prophetic office he *did works in his Father's name, which bore witness of him*.<sup>4)</sup> But in that same office, being God and of the same divine essence with the Father, he also did miracles in his own name, saying, *Young man, I SAY unto thee, Arise*,<sup>5)</sup> and *manifesting forth HIS glory*,<sup>6)</sup> *the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*.<sup>7)</sup> And as such he was the prophet like whom there was not and cannot be another among men. *No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him*.<sup>8)</sup> *Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him*.<sup>9)</sup> He is the Word which was in the beginning *with God and the Word that was God*. He is the prophet *sent of God and the prophet who is God*.

As the divine official spokesman of God Christ was accredited by miracles. When he was asked, *Art thou he that should come?*<sup>10)</sup> his answer was, *The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have the gospel preached to them*.<sup>11)</sup> Thus Christ's doctrine and his miracles went together. Jesus of Nazareth would not be looked upon and sought as a magnetic healer, and when he knew that those who had witnessed his miracles would only speak of his mak-

1) 1 Cor. 1, 30.

2) John 6, 14; cf. 1, 21.

3) Acts 2, 22.

4) John 10, 25.

5) Luke 7, 14.

6) John 2, 11.

7) John 1, 14.

8) John 1, 18.

9) Matt. 11, 27.

10) Matt. 11, 3.

11) Matt. 11, 5.

ing the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak,<sup>1)</sup> *he charged them that they should tell no man.*<sup>2)</sup> When Christ fed the five thousand whom he had *taught many things,*<sup>3)</sup> *speaking unto them of the kingdom of God,*<sup>4)</sup> he achieved his purpose when they who *had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world.*<sup>5)</sup> But when others, instead of believing in him as the Prophet sent of God, set about *to make him a king* according to their own perverse notions, *he departed again into a mountain, himself alone.*<sup>6)</sup> When in his own country he achieved little by his doctrine beyond the astonishment of those who said, *Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son? etc.,*<sup>7)</sup> and some were even *offended in him.*<sup>8)</sup> Jesus rebuked them for slighting his prophetic office,<sup>9)</sup> and *he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.*<sup>10)</sup> That men might know and believe that the Father was in him and he in the Father,<sup>11)</sup> was the end and aim of his miracles. *I told you, said he, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me.*<sup>12)</sup> Thus was Jesus of Nazareth *approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs,*<sup>13)</sup> and there were those who understood this relation of Christ's words and works. *We know, said Nicodemus, that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.*<sup>14)</sup> And when by the very beginning of miracles Jesus *manifested forth his glory, his disciples believed on him.*<sup>15)</sup> Thus, also, *when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did.*<sup>16)</sup>

1) Mark 7, 37.

2) Mark 7, 36; cf. 5, 43. Matt. 8, 4; 9, 30; 12, 16.

3) Mark 6, 34.

4) Luke 9, 11.

5) John 6, 14.

6) John 6, 15.

7) Matt. 13, 54 f.

8) Matt. 13, 57.

9) Ibid. v. 57.

10) Ibid. v. 58.

11) John 10, 38.

12) John 10, 25.

13) Acts 2, 22.

14) John 3, 2.

15) John 2, 11.

16) John 2, 23.



It has been said above<sup>1)</sup> that Christ's resurrection was a divine acknowledgment of the completeness of the work of redemption and of Christ's atoning sacrifice. But not only in his priesthood was Jesus publicly acknowledged in and by his resurrection. When the Jews demanded a sign whereby he would establish his authority for casting out the abominations from the temple of the Lord, he said, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.*<sup>2)</sup> But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them and they BELIEVED the scripture, and THE WORD WHICH JESUS HAD SAID.<sup>3)</sup> Thus did the sign whereby Jonas was declared a prophet of the Lord to the men of Niniveh prefigure the greater sign whereby Jesus, greater than Jonas, was declared a prophet sent of God.<sup>4)</sup> This connection between the word of Christ and his resurrection was pointed out in the angelic easter sermon preached to the women of Galilee in the empty sepulchre, when the angel said, *Tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him,* AS HE SAID UNTO YOU.<sup>5)</sup> This was the great argument employed by the apostles to accomplish their object of establishing the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ.<sup>6)</sup> And to this day the resurrection of Christ is the keystone of Christianity. When Lepaux, member of the French Directory, complained to Talleyrand of the little headway he made with his new religion, Theophilanthropy, Talleyrand recommended a very simple method whereby his friend might hope to gain ground for his enterprise, and when asked what that method was, he said: "Preach your doctrine, work miracles, heal the sick, quicken the dead, then be crucified and buried, and

---

1) pp. 141. 150.

2) John 2, 21 f. Cf. Matt. 12, 39 f.

3) Mark 16, 7; cf. 14, 28. Matt. 26, 32.

4) Acts 2, 24; 3, 15. 26; 4, 10; 5, 30; 10, 40; 13, 30. 33. 34. 37; 17, 31;

26, 8. 1 Cor. 15, 14—17.

2) John 2, 18.

4) Matt. 12, 39 f.

rise again on the third day, and you may meet with a fair measure of success."—

Christ, in his prophetic office, was not the originator of a new religion. *Search the scriptures*, we hear him say; *for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.*<sup>1)</sup> When he preached at Nazareth, he expounded the prophet Isaiah.<sup>2)</sup> And when he was risen from the dead, he reprimanded his disciples for being slow of heart to believe all that the prophets had spoken, and *beginning from Moses and all the prophets expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.*<sup>3)</sup> Even the eleven, his apostles, who had heard his doctrine and witnessed his miracles for years and seen him risen from the dead, were by their risen Lord instructed from the scriptures as he said, "*These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets; and in the psalms, concerning me.*" Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, and said unto them, "THUS IT IS WRITTEN, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."<sup>4)</sup> In fact, it was the Spirit of Christ that was in the prophets and testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.<sup>5)</sup> Israel of old drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ.<sup>6)</sup> In various Messianic psalms and in the Prophets the Son of God speaks of himself in prophecy, predicting what he should do and suffer after his incarnation.<sup>7)</sup> What the Son of God had spoken by the prophets long before his coming into the flesh, he did not set aside when he was made flesh.

1) John 5, 39.

2) Luke 4, 16—21.

3) Luke 24, 25—27.

4) Luke 24, 44—47.

5) 1 Pet. 1, 11.

6) 1 Cor. 10, 4.

7) Ps. 16. 22. 40. 69. Is. 50, 6; 61, 1. Cf. Luke 4, 18 ff.



Least of all was Christ, in his prophetic office, a new lawgiver. When he did preach the law, it was the law of Moses, the sum and substance of which was, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind*, and, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*.<sup>1)</sup> In the Sermon on the Mount, he did not extend or amend, but only exhibit and expound, the law.<sup>2)</sup> And when a certain lawyer had quoted the summary of the law as it was written in the law, Jesus did not correct him, but *said unto him, "Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live."*<sup>3)</sup> Christ himself, being *made under the law*,<sup>4)</sup> walked according to the old commandments, giving us *an example* that we should *do as he has done*,<sup>5)</sup> *walk even as he has walked*,<sup>6)</sup> *follow his footsteps*.<sup>7)</sup> And inasmuch as in his fulfillment of the law, also in his suffering, loving his brethren to the end and praying for his enemies, he has set us an example, that taking upon us his yoke we may *learn of him*,<sup>8)</sup> he is, in this, our prophet, teaching the law, the old law of love, by his example. This is his new commandment. *Love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another*.<sup>9)</sup>

But Christ's proper prophetic task and work was to preach the gospel of the kingdom<sup>10)</sup> to show the glad tidings of the kingdom of God.<sup>11)</sup> For this was he anointed and sent, *to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord*.<sup>12)</sup> When he taught and preached in the cities, *the poor had the gospel preached to them*,<sup>13)</sup> and this was whereby he would be known as *he that should come*.<sup>14)</sup> At that time he said, *I thank thee,*

1) Matt. 22, 37—39. Cf. Deut. 6, 5; 10, 12; 30, 6. — Lev. 19, 18.

2) Matt. 5—7.

3) Luke 10, 26—28.

4) Gal. 4, 4.

5) John 13, 15.

6) 1 John 2, 6.

7) 1 Pet. 2, 21.

8) Matt. 11, 29.

9) John 13, 34; cf. 15, 12.

10) Matt. 4, 23. Mark 1, 14.

11) Luke 8, 1.

12) Luke 4, 18—22.

13) Matt. 11, 1. 5.

14) Matt. 11, 3.



*O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes;*<sup>1)</sup> and then continued, *Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.*<sup>2)</sup> Thus Christ, in his prophetic as in his priestly office, is eminently the Savior, *preaching deliverance to the captives, as gracious words proceeded out of his mouth.*<sup>3)</sup> He came and preached peace;<sup>4)</sup> the peace which he established in his priesthood he dispensed in his prophetic office.<sup>5)</sup> Being the prophet sent of God, it was his task to announce the will and counsel of God. And hence we hear him say, *"This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life."*<sup>6)</sup> Hence, when he taught his disciples, *he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning HIMSELF.*<sup>7)</sup> In his sacerdotal prayer he says, *This is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*<sup>8)</sup> To communicate such saving knowledge was his prophetic work; and of its performance he says, *I have given unto them thy words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have KNOWN surely that I came out from thee, and they have BELIEVED that thou didst send me.*<sup>9)</sup> And again, *O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have KNOWN thee, and these have KNOWN that thou hast sent me. And I have DECLARED unto them thy name, and will declare it, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them and I in them.*<sup>10)</sup>

When Christ here says, *I WILL declare, γνωρίσω, I will make known*, he points to a continuation of his prophetic work. To the last moments of his visible presence among his disciples we find him occupied with this work, *speaking*

1) Matt. 11, 25.

2) Matt. 11, 28.

3) Luke 4, 18. 22.

4) Eph. 2, 17.

5) John 14, 27; 20, 19. 26. Eph. 2, 14—17.

6) John 6, 40.

7) Luke 24, 27; cf. v. 44.

8) John 17, 3.

9) John 17, 8.

10) John 17, 25 f.

*of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.*<sup>1)</sup> Nor did his office terminate when he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight. His parting words recorded are, *Ye shall be witnesses unto me.*<sup>2)</sup> He was the prophet sent of God; and his work was not to come to a close after his exaltation. *As my Father has sent me, even so send I you,* said he as he endowed them with the power and authority to dispense the benefits of his redemption.<sup>3)</sup> As he had preached the gospel, he also charged his church, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature;*<sup>4)</sup> and when they, in obedience to this charge, went forth and preached everywhere, *the Lord worked with them.*<sup>5)</sup> It was *his* work which they performed. *Repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name,*<sup>6)</sup> as by ministers of Christ,<sup>7)</sup> who *prayed* IN CHRIST'S STEAD, *Be ye reconciled to God,* and whose word was his word, as he had said, *He that heareth you heareth me.*<sup>8)</sup> St. Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, is everywhere *an apostle of Jesus Christ,*<sup>9)</sup> and says, *I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed.*<sup>10)</sup> Christ is the chief Shepherd,<sup>11)</sup> and the lambs and sheep to be fed by his ministers are *his.*<sup>12)</sup> To this day he gives preachers of righteousness, as from the beginning *he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.*<sup>13)</sup> Hence one doctrine only is admissible in the church of Christ, the doctrine of the one prophet sent of God, whose ministers are truly his ministers only as far as their doctrine is his. Paul, the apostle of Christ, is not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ;<sup>14)</sup> yea more, he pronounces the curse even

1) Acts 1, 3. Cf. Mark 16. Luke 24. John 20 and 21.

2) Acts 1, 8. Cf. Luke 24, 48. 49.

3) John 20, 21—23.

4) Mark 14, 15.

5) Mark 14, 20.

6) Luke 24, 47.

7) 1 Cor. 4, 1.

8) Luke 10, 16.

9) 1 Cor. 1, 1. 2 Cor. 1, 1. Gal. 1, 1. al.

10) Rom. 15, 18.

11) 1 Pet. 5, 4.

12) John 21, 15—17. Cf. Acts 20, 28.

13) Eph. 4, 11.

14) Rom. 1, 16.



upon the angel from heaven who should preach another gospel than that which he has preached.<sup>1)</sup> In Christian households and congregations the *word of Christ should dwell richly in all wisdom;*<sup>2)</sup> and the doctrine which should be voiced forth from the church throughout the world is again *the word of the Lord.*<sup>3)</sup> *The doctrine of Christ* is the doctrine of the only true religion. *Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST, hath not God. He that abideth in the DOCTRINE OF CHRIST, he hath both the Father and the Son.*<sup>4)</sup>

And the doctrine of Christ is the doctrine of Moses and the prophets, of the Scriptures. Though the Canon of holy Scripture was enlarged by the addition of the inspired writings of the New Testament, the Spirit of Christ who was in the holy penmen did *not speak of himself;*<sup>5)</sup> but only exhibited with greater clearness and in more plentiful measure *those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets;*<sup>6)</sup> and what Christ had taught in accordance therewith.<sup>7)</sup> *He shall take of mine and shew it unto you;*<sup>8)</sup> said Christ when he promised the coming of the Spirit of truth, who, while he would guide Christ's own disciples into all truth, would not speak of himself, but whatsoever he should hear.<sup>9)</sup> Thus, for all time, *one is our Master, even Christ,*<sup>10)</sup> who has said, *If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.*<sup>11)</sup> By this saving truth Christ the Prophet is to-day and for all times the Savior, whose gospel, *the gospel of Christ, is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.*<sup>12)</sup> This is the word of the truth of the gospel, which *is in all the world and bringeth forth fruit,*<sup>13)</sup> and whereby *the Father hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.*<sup>14)</sup>

1) Gal. 1, 8. 9.    2) Col. 3, 16.    3) 1 Thess. 1, 8.    4) 2 John 9.

5) John 16, 13.    6) Acts 3, 18.; cf. 10, 43; 15, 15.    7) Acts 1, 1.

8) John 16, 14. 15.    9) John 16, 13.    10) Matt. 23, 8. 10.

11) John 8, 31 f.    12) Rom. 3, 16.    13) Col. 1, 5 f.    14) Col. 1, 13.

### Christ the King.

When Jesus said before Pilate, I AM A KING, he bore witness unto the truth.<sup>1)</sup> In the exercise of his prophetic office he, the suffering High Priest, authoritatively pronounced himself a king. He does not say, "I shall be a king;" for when he was in the manger, he was declared Christ the Lord, and the Christ, the promised Messiah, was prophesied a king.<sup>2)</sup> Hence the enquiry of the wise men from the East after Him that was born King of the Jews,<sup>3)</sup> and their offerings meet for a king.<sup>4)</sup> Prefigured even in the days of Abraham by that mysterious priest and king to whom Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils,<sup>5)</sup> and prophesied a priest after the order of Melchizedek,<sup>6)</sup> he is a *King of righteousness* and a *King of Salem, which is, King of peace.*<sup>7)</sup> Of him the psalmist said, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.*<sup>8)</sup> His kingdom is universal. He is *King of kings and Lord of lords.*<sup>9)</sup> This royal dignity is not identical with his divine majesty, but an *official* capacity. *I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion,* says the Lord.<sup>10)</sup> Christ is king by divine appointment, in power and dignity conferred upon him. *All power is GIVEN unto him in heaven and in earth.*<sup>11)</sup>

In his vast kingdom Christ the God-man has various subjects, and he rules them in various ways. His kingdom is a kingdom of *power*, a kingdom of *grace*, and a kingdom of *glory*.

Christ's kingdom is a *kingdom of power* inasmuch as he with his omnipotence governs the universe, controlling

1) John 18, 37.

2) Jer. 23, 5. 6. Is. 9, 6 f. Numb. 24, 17. Ps. 110, 2. Cf. Hebr. 1, 8.

3) Matt. 2, 2.

4) Matt. 2, 11.

5) Gen. 14, 18—20.

6) Ps. 110, 4.

7) Hebr. 7, 2.

8) Ps. 110, 1. 2. Cf. Matt. 22, 41—44. Mark 12, 35—37. Luke 20, 41—44. Acts 2, 34. 1 Cor. 15, 25. Hebr. 1, 13. 1 Pet. 3, 22.

9) Rev. 19, 16.

10) Ps. 2, 6.

11) Matt. 28, 18.



and directing all creatures according to his wise and good and just purposes. Hereof the psalmist says, *Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put ALL THINGS under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field.*<sup>1)</sup> His dominion is universal. *For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him.*<sup>2)</sup> *There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away.*<sup>3)</sup> Heaven and earth and hell, rational and irrational creatures, animate and inanimate beings, all things, are subject to his royal sceptre. The winds and the sea obey him;<sup>4)</sup> disease and death are at his command;<sup>5)</sup> the devils ask his permission to go away into the swine.<sup>6)</sup> And all this not only according to his divine nature, but also according to his human nature, not only after his exaltation, but also in the days of his humility. For all power, which he had from eternity according to his divinity, was *given unto him* in time according to his humanity;<sup>7)</sup> and the God-man was not exalted to royal dignity and power after his resurrection or ascension, but was born a king,<sup>8)</sup> and by innumerable miracles, before his exaltation, manifested his dominion over angels and men and devils, disease and death,<sup>9)</sup> wind and waves,<sup>10)</sup> the water in the waterpots,<sup>11)</sup> the fishes in the lake,<sup>12)</sup> the figtree in the way.<sup>13)</sup> Christ's humiliation consisted in this very *ξένωσις*, that, being a king, he took upon himself the form of a servant, in his abstinence from the full and constant use and exercise of his royal power and dominion according to his human nature. It is pathet-

1) Ps. 8, 6. 7. Cf. Hebr. 2, 7. 8.

2) Hebr. 2, 8.

3) Dan. 7, 14. Cf. Phil. 2, 10. 11. Eph. 1, 21. 22. 1 Pet. 3, 22.

4) Matt. 8, 27.

5) The miracles of Christ.

6) Matt. 8, 28 ff.

7) Matt. 28, 18.

8) Micah 5, 1 f. Matt. 2, 2. 6. Luke 2, 11. Is. 9, 6. al.

9) Mark 5, 41 f. John 11, 43 f.

10) Matt. 8, 23 ff.

11) John 2, 7 ff.

12) Luke 5, 1 ff.

13) Matt. 21, 19—21.

ically significant that in the depth of his humiliation he suffered himself to be decked out in the mockery of a sham sceptre and purple and crown, the insignia of royalty.<sup>1)</sup> But having drunk of the brook in the way, he lifted up his royal head,<sup>2)</sup> and in his exaltation he resumed the full and constant use and exercise of his power and sway, being crowned with glory and honor.<sup>3)</sup> Especially is his sitting at the right hand of God that feature of his exaltation whereby he entered into the full and constant participation, according to his human nature, in the exercise of the universal dominion, rule, and government over heaven and earth and all creatures.<sup>4)</sup> The final judgment, too, will be a manifestation of his royal majesty and exercise of his universal dominion. When *the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations, then shall THE KING say unto them on his right hand, Come, etc.*<sup>5)</sup> Then it will be manifest to sight, what we now believe, though *now we see not yet all things put under him*,<sup>6)</sup> and Christ's kingdom of power is an article of faith revealed in the word.

And this *rex tremendæ majestatis* is revealed to us as *a Prince and a Savior*.<sup>7)</sup> He was the Savior not only in his abstinence from his omnipotent rule of heaven and earth, but also in its exercise. It is remarkable that the miracles of Jesus were acts of beneficence, as, *being anointed with power, he went about doing good*.<sup>8)</sup> Moses changed water into blood; Jesus, into wine. Elisha said to Gehazi, "The leprosy of Naaman shall cleave unto thee and unto thy seed for ever;" and he went out from his presence a leper.<sup>9)</sup> Jesus said, to the leper, "I will; be thou clean;" and immediately his leprosy was cleansed.<sup>10)</sup> All power is given

1) Matt. 27, 28 ff. John 19, 2 ff.

2) Ps. 110, 7.

3) Hebr. 2, 7—9.

4) Phil. 2, 9—11.

1) Pet. 3, 22. Eph. 1, 20—23.

5) Matt. 25, 31 ff.

6) Hebr. 2, 8.

7) Acts 5, 31.

8) Acts 10, 38.

9) 2 Kings 5, 27.

10) Matt. 8, 3.



unto him in heaven and in earth; *therefore* shall the work of extending his church among all nations be carried on even unto the end of the world.<sup>1)</sup> He holds power and sway over the gates of hell, and this power and sway he has promised to exercise in the defense and protection of his church, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.<sup>2)</sup> The power wherewith he rules the universe is omnipotence;<sup>3)</sup> and the working of that mighty power which was wrought in Christ is exercised to *usward who believe*.<sup>4)</sup> He is the lord and ruler of all things in heaven and in earth and under the earth,<sup>5)</sup> of *all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come*.<sup>6)</sup> And hence *we are more than conquerors through him that loved us*,<sup>7)</sup> and *neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord*.<sup>8)</sup>

Yet, while Christ the King exerts his mighty power in and for his church on earth, and his believers are not exempt from but included in his kingdom of power, he has his peculiar dealings with those of his subjects who hold a peculiar relation to him, who are his own in a peculiar sense,<sup>9)</sup> a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.<sup>10)</sup> Christ's kingdom is a *kingdom of grace* inasmuch as he, the only head of his church, rules his spiritual subjects, jointly and severally, by his word. The church of Christ is not a democracy, where majorities rule; nor an aristocracy with a ruling superior class; but it is a monarchy, where the will of the king is the law of the realm, where all power is vested in the sov-

1) Matt. 28, 18—20.

2) Matt. 16, 18.

3) Matt. 28, 18.

4) Eph. 1, 19. 20.

5) Phil. 2, 10 f.

6) Eph. 1, 21. 22.

7) Rom. 8, 37.

8) Rom. 8, 38. 39. Cf. John 10, 28. Rom. 8, 28.

9) 2 Tim. 2, 19.

10) 1 Pet. 2, 9.

ereign, and the subjects have just such and so many rights as the king has given them. The members of this *holy nation*, this *peculiar people*, are all those and only those whom God has *called out of darkness into his marvelous light*,<sup>1)</sup> whom he has *delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son*,<sup>2)</sup> *saints and faithful in Christ Jesus*.<sup>3)</sup> This kingdom, though in the world,<sup>4)</sup> is *not of this world*.<sup>5)</sup> It is even now and on earth the *kingdom of heaven*.<sup>6)</sup> When Christ was asked when the kingdom of God should come, he answered and said, *The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you*.<sup>7)</sup> It is an invisible, spiritual kingdom. As in the government of the world God has his ministers,<sup>8)</sup> so also in his kingdom of grace there are *ministers of Christ*,<sup>9)</sup> but their ministry differs from that of the rulers of states and nations of this world. *Ye know*, says Jesus, *that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you*.<sup>10)</sup> “*Not that we have dominion over your faith*,”<sup>11)</sup> “*neither as being lords over God’s heritage*,”<sup>12)</sup> say the great apostles of Christ. In this kingdom of Christ there is but *one Lord*,<sup>13)</sup> and but one authority and power, that of the word and of Christ in the word. Civil rulers bear the sword;<sup>14)</sup> but in the kingdom of grace *the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, casting down IMAGINATIONS, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the KNOWLEDGE OF GOD, and bringing into captivity every thought to the OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST*.<sup>15)</sup>

1) 1 Pet. 2, 9.      2) Col. 1, 16.      3) Phil. 1, 1. Col. 1, 2. Eph. 1, 1.

4) John 17, 11.      5) John 18, 36; 17, 14; 15, 19.

6) Matt. 3, 2; 4, 17; 13, 24. 31. 33. 44. 47; 18, 23; 20, 1; 22, 1; 25, 1.

7) Luke 17, 20. 21.      8) Rom. 13, 4.      9) 1 Cor. 4, 1.

10) Matt. 20, 25. Mark 10, 42. Luke 22, 25.      11) 2 Cor. 1, 24.

12) 1 Pet. 5, 3.      13) Eph. 4, 5. 1 Cor. 8, 6; 12, 5.

14) Rom. 13, 4.      15) 2 Cor. 10, 4. 5.



To set up a throne to human reason and imaginations in the church is treason and rebellion. To teach or entertain doctrines contrary to those which convey the true knowledge of God in Christ Jesus is making war against the king of truth. Every thought which sets itself against a word of Christ must be subdued and led captive by the weapons which constitute the panoply of Christ's warriors, especially by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.<sup>1)</sup> To claim for a visible church the dignity of the spiritual kingdom of Christ is to pervert the very nature of that kingdom; and he who demands homage as the visible head of the church is a rebellious pretender and impostor, not a vicegerent of Christ, but Antichrist.<sup>2)</sup> To wield the secular sword and exercise the police power of the state in the government and discipline of the church, or to rule the state by the means of grace and the discipline of the church, is disorder and misrule in church and state.<sup>3)</sup> Anarchy is to be discountenanced in the church no less than in the state. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls,*<sup>4)</sup> is a divine commandment as truly binding upon all Christians in the church as we are *put in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates,*<sup>5)</sup> in the state; and *Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor,* is said especially of those *who labor in the word and doctrine.*<sup>6)</sup> But they rule "by the word and doctrine." The apostle says, *Know them which labor among you, and ARE OVER YOU IN THE LORD and ADMONISH YOU;*<sup>7)</sup> and they admonish, or beseech, *by the mercies of God.*<sup>8)</sup> Christ's spiritual subjects are ruled precisely by that which makes them free. They are exhorted to *stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.*<sup>9)</sup> And they are

---

1) Eph. 6, 13—17.

2) 2 Thess. 2, 3. 4. 8—11. 1 John 2, 18. Dan. 11, 36—45.

3) Matt. 22, 11.

4) Hebr. 13, 17.

5) Tit. 3, 1. Cf. 1 Pet. 2, 13. 14. Rom. 13, 1.

6) 1 Tim. 5, 17.

7) 1 Thess. 5, 12.

8) Rom. 12, 1.

9) Gal. 5, 1.

made free by the truth which they learn as they continue in the word of Christ.<sup>1)</sup> Christ, *the HEAD of the church, is also the SAVIOR of his body.*<sup>2)</sup> In his kingdom of grace he, the King of righteousness, divides the spoil of his victories, and his subjects rejoice.<sup>3)</sup> Forgiveness of sins, the peace of God which surpasses all understanding, comfort in all our afflictions, hope and joy even in the valley of the shadow of death, are the blessings dispensed to the subjects of this kingdom. And all this of grace, and by the means of grace, according to Christ's ordinances. As he distributed the loaves and fishes through his disciples, so he has ordained that the public administration of his spiritual benefits shall be performed by the ministry which he has established,<sup>4)</sup> and that *all things be done decently and in order.*<sup>5)</sup> The powers which the King has delegated to his subjects must be exercised according to the King's own instructions. He has determined how the keys of the kingdom of heaven shall be applied to their proper purposes.<sup>6)</sup> He has prescribed and defined the qualifications for the ministry in the church.<sup>7)</sup> He has for all times ordained how his sacraments shall be administered, saying, *This do ye;*<sup>8)</sup> he has also determined who should and who should not be permitted to eat of the sacramental bread and drink of the cup of the Lord,<sup>9)</sup> and it is not charity but rebellious presumption to set aside his royal will by what is called open communion. He has made his spiritual subjects *fellowcitizens with the saints,*<sup>10)</sup> and it is gross disloyalty and treason when Christians are leagued together in unholy alliance with the enemies of their King and his kingdom in the face of his injunction. *Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellow-*

1) John 8, 31. 32.

2) Eph. 5, 23.

3) Is. 9, 3.

4) 1 Cor. 12, 29. Rom. 10, 15. 2 Cor. 5, 18. Acts 20, 28. 1 Pet. 5, 2.

5) 1 Cor. 14, 40.

6) Matt. 18, 15—17. 1 Cor. 5, 13.

7) 1 Tim. 3, 2. 3; 3, 4—7. Tit. 1, 5—9. 1 Cor. 14, 34. 1 Tim. 2, 12.

8) Matt. 28, 18—20. 1 Cor. 11, 24 f. Luke 22, 19.

9) 1 Cor. 11, 27—29. Matt. 26, 26. 27.

10) Eph. 2, 20.

*ship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?*<sup>1)</sup> *Be not conformed to this world.*<sup>2)</sup> *A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject.*<sup>3)</sup> *Come out from them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord.*<sup>4)</sup> On the contrary, it is the duty of a loyal subject of Christ to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ,<sup>5)</sup> to wear a good warfare,<sup>6)</sup> to fight a good fight,<sup>7)</sup> against the flesh, the world, and the devil, all the enemies of Christ and of his kingdom. For the church of Christ on earth is a church militant,<sup>8)</sup> until we shall say with St. Paul, *I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not unto me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.*<sup>9)</sup> This is our hope: *The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his HEAVENLY KINGDOM.*

This "heavenly kingdom" is Christ's *kingdom of glory*, in which Christ the God-man forever reigns over angels and archangels and the glorified elect, the church triumphant, and his subjects forever do him homage and serve him in perfect obedience, praise and adore him, their Savior and their King. In the kingdom of glory, as in the kingdom of power and grace, Christ is king in an official capacity; his kinghood is not identical with his divinity. He is the King of glory by appointment, and not only in his state of exaltation, but from the time of his incarnation. *I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto*

1) 2 Cor. 6, 14—16.

2) Rom. 12, 2.

3) Tit. 3, 10.

4) 2 Cor. 6, 17.

5) 2 Tim. 2, 3.

6) 1 Tim. 1, 18.

7) 1 Tim. 6, 12. 2 Tim. 4, 7.

8) Eph. 6, 10. 11. 1 John 5, 4. John 15, 18—21.

9) 2 Tim. 4, 7 f.



*me*, he said in the days of his humility;<sup>1)</sup> and when he was cradled in a manger, the heavenly host were his subjects and chanted his cradle song of *glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.*<sup>2)</sup> Paradise on high was *his kingdom* on the day of his deepest humility, when the robber by his side prayed, *Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom*, and he replied, *this day shalt thou be with me in paradise.*<sup>3)</sup> Yet, as Christ, though the King of glory by birth, entered into his glory,<sup>4)</sup> *the glory that should follow* after his sufferings,<sup>5)</sup> so also Christ's subjects enter into the kingdom of God through much tribulation,<sup>6)</sup> though they are already in the kingdom of God. Thus it is scriptural to distinguish between these different phases of Christ's kingdom, though the kingdom is one as the King is one. *Our conversation is in heaven*<sup>7)</sup> even now; but *it doth not yet appear what we shall be.*<sup>8)</sup> But *when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear in glory.*<sup>9)</sup> Now Christ is with us alway;<sup>10)</sup> then *we shall ever be with the Lord.*<sup>11)</sup> Now we are the children of God by faith;<sup>12)</sup> and *walk by faith, not by sight;*<sup>13)</sup> then *we shall see him as he is.*<sup>14)</sup> Now *we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.*<sup>15)</sup> Now *we see through a glass darkly; but then, face to face.*<sup>16)</sup> Now the Lord knoweth them that are his;<sup>17)</sup> then *we shall know even as we are known,*<sup>18)</sup> and being with him where he is, we shall *behold his glory*<sup>19)</sup> and *see his face.*<sup>20)</sup> Into that state of per-

1) Luke 22, 29.

2) Luke 2, 14.

3) Luke 23, 42. 43.

4) Luke 24, 26.

5) 1 Pet. 1, 11.

6) Acts 14, 22. Cf. 2 Pet. 1, 11.

7) Phil. 3, 20.

8) 1 John 3, 2.

9) Col. 3, 3.

10) Matt. 28, 20.

11) 1 Thess. 4, 17. John 17, 24. Phil. 1, 23.

12) Gal. 3, 26.

13) 2 Cor. 5, 7.

14) 1 John 3, 2. Cf. Rev. 22, 4. Job 19, 26. Matt. 5, 8.

15) 1 Cor. 13, 10.

16) 1 Cor. 13, 12.

17) 2 Tim. 2, 19.

18) 1 Cor. 13, 12.

19) John 17, 24.

20) Rev. 22, 4.

fection and glory with Christ we enter, according to the soul, in the hour of death. For this reason we *have a desire to depart, and to be with Christ*,<sup>1)</sup> knowing that *to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord*,<sup>2)</sup> with Christ *in Paradise*.<sup>3)</sup> But the kingdom of glory will be fully consummated when, after the resurrection of the dead, *the King shall say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*, and the righteous shall go, body and soul, *into life eternal*.<sup>4)</sup> Among the subjects of that kingdom of glory there will be various degrees of glory.<sup>5)</sup> But all the glory of the righteous will redound to the glory of their King.<sup>6)</sup>

A. G.

---

1) Phil. 1, 23.

2) 2 Cor. 5, 8. Cf. Acts 7, 59. Eccl. 12, 7.

3) Luke 23, 43.

4) Matt. 25, 34. 46.

5) 1 Cor. 15, 41 f. Rom. 2, 6 f. 10.

6) Rev. 4, 10. 11; 5, 8—12.

## Historical Theology.

---

### THE ROMEWARD MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.

False notions of the Church and the Ministry, tares sown by the arch-enemy in early days of Christianity, were the germs from which, in the course of time, that great Mystery of Iniquity, the Papacy, was developed. That the church of God is the whole number of all believers, an invisible body of which Christ is the invisible and only Head, who rules supreme by his word; that all the powers of the Church are vested in the local congregation of believers; that the holy office established by Christ in and for his church is a ministerial office instituted for the public administration of the means of grace, and conferred upon its incumbents by Christ through the call of the congregation—these simple truths were soon lost sight of. The true concepts of the Church and the Ministry were perverted into those of a visible hierarchy with visible rulers of various limits of jurisdiction and power, inferior and superior bishops, country bishops, and city bishops, and metropolitan bishops, and, by and by, ecumenical bishops, and, finally, a Supreme Pontiff, the Pope, who arrogated to himself the dignity and authority of a visible head and infallible teacher of the Church Universal. As long as these false notions of the Church prevailed, every effort to bring about a Reformation was necessarily futile. The great Doctors of the fifteenth century, who spoke of a Reformation of the Church in Head and Members, by these very words, and by their actions suited to these words, bore witness to their utter ignorance of both the malady and the remedy. For to think of reforming the true Head of the Church is blasphemy, and to think of reforming the false head of the Church is foolishness. Like the sublime fool who with much ostentation ousts a



thief from his treasure house and at once turns it over to another thief, the great "reformatory" synods committed the ineffable folly of enthroning a new tyrant on the anti-christian See which they had pronounced vacant with so much ado, and which ought to have remained vacant till doomsday, and the second half of the century of the great Councils saw some of the greatest scoundrels of all ages on the purported See of St. Peter. It was in the first quarter of the next century, during the Pontificate of a proud Medicean infidel, that God raised up his own Reformer. *Dominus et Magister noster Christus dicendo*, were the opening words of Luther's ninety-five Theses, and the day when these words were given to the world has been fitly called the birthday of the Reformation. It was Luther who taught all those who were willing to learn that the Babylonian Captivity which had endured a thousand years had been, first of all, a captivity of Christ's word and sacraments, and it was not until Luther again taught and millions of Christians again learned the true doctrine of the Church and the Ministry, that the Reformation became an established fact.

Zwingli and Calvin and their followers never grasped the true biblical concept of the means of grace. In fact, the Calvinistic scheme of theology excludes the doctrine of the appropriation of the benefits of Christ's universal redemption to the individual sinner by the word of the gospel and the sacraments. And hence the Calvinistic idea of the Ministry is not and cannot consistently be that of a divine office for the public administration of the means of grace, whereby saving faith is engendered and preserved and the forgiveness of sins is truly and actually and earnestly offered to all who hear the word and partake of the sacraments.

In England, the Lutheran movement, having been held down by a royal political schemer and hard-shell Romanist in spite of his conflict with the Pope, was, about the middle of the century, superseded by a Calvinistic movement which

led to the establishment of a Calvinistic state church with a Calvinistic creed. On the other hand, this Anglican establishment was never thoroughly and entirely purged from certain residues of Romanism. As distinguished from the "Protestant" element there was from the beginning a "Catholic" element in the Anglican Church. Regard for this element was not without influence in shaping the Articles and the Prayer-Book. It was represented by Archbishop Laud and other "High-church" theologians, who laid stress on the Apostolic Succession, Patristic tradition, and what has been termed a sacerdotal view of the sacraments, in point of doctrine, and exhibited ritualistic tendencies in the forms of public worship. In all these points they differed from the "Low-church" party, of which Jewel, Stillingfleet, Hoadley, and Wilberforce, the leader of the Evangelicals, were exponents. But while Low-church theology was more or less pronouncedly Calvinistic and admitted even of the far-gone rationalism of some Broad-church or Latitudinarian teachers, the High-church traditions were by no means Lutheran, but more or less distinctly Romanizing. Thus, for example, the "real presence" in the Eucharist taught by the High-church theologians was not the presence of the true body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the consecrated elements distributed to and taken by the communicants, but a presence of Christ's body and blood, or of the whole Christ, in the forms of bread and wine on the altar, after the consecration and before the distribution, or "while the elements are unconsumed." Anglican Ritualists did not manifest a leaning toward, but a repugnance to Lutheranism. The High-church party in the Anglican church is not a continuation of the Lutheran movement of the first half of the sixteenth century, but a residuary charge of Romanism, and "Reunion" in the mouth of the Anglican Ritualist means corporate union with the Roman church and, perhaps, with the Greek church, never with the Lutheran church, the true Church of the Reformation.

All this will appear more clearly and in detail, as we shall view the ascendancy of this "Catholic element" of the Anglican Church in the nineteenth century, in a movement which is still going on, not only in Great Britain and the English colonies, but also in the United States of America.

The Tractarian movement has been so called from a series of "Tracts for the Times," which appeared in the course of nine years, from September 9, 1833, to January 25, 1841. By far the greater number of these tracts were short treatises of 4, 6, 7, 8, or 12 pages; some, especially the later, numbers were longer, covering 35, 56, and even 100 and more pages. Among the subjects set forth in these Tracts, some of which were directed *Ad Clerum*, others *Ad Populum*, still others *Ad Scholas*, we find the following: "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission," "The Catholic Church," "Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the safest course," "The Episcopal Church Apostolical," "The visible church," "The Ember Days," "On the Apostolical Succession in the English Church," "Thoughts on the benefits of the system of Fasting enjoined by our Church," "Mortification of the flesh a Scripture duty," "The Scripture view of the Apostolic Commission," "The necessity and advantage of frequent Communion," "The standing Ordinances of Religion," "Primitive Episcopacy," "Rites and customs of the Church," "Sermons for Saints' Days and Holidays," "The Antiquity of the existing Liturgies," "Scriptural view of Holy Baptism," "On the Controversy with the Romanists," "On the Roman Breviary as embodying the substance of the devotional Services of the Church Catholic," "On Purgatory," "On Reserve in communicating religious knowledge," "Whether a Clergyman of the Church of England be now bound to have Morning and Evening Prayers daily in his Parish Church," "Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles." These titles may serve to indicate, in a general way, the trend, not only of the "Tracts for the



Times," but of the entire movement to which they gave rise and impetus. The authors are seen to be of the High-church party; for if they had given voice to interests of Low-church or Evangelicals, their subjects would probably have been such as, "The Suppression of Vice," "Missions and Missionaries," "Bible Societies," "The Slave Trade," "Education Societies," "The advancement of Christianity among infidels in Virginia." The Tract writers were not Calvinists or Liberals, but opposed to both Calvinism and Liberalism. They were of that element in the Anglican Church which was from the very beginning leavened with Romanism as pointed out in our introductory remarks.

Who the authors were, was, with a few exceptions, not announced by the Tracts, which were published in London, most of them without the names or initials of the contributors. But they were not of London growth. The first three, and twenty-five of the subsequent tracts, were written by J. H. Newman, a Fellow of Oriel College at Oxford, and, since 1828, incumbent of St. Mary's and chaplain of Littlemore. The author of Tract No. IV, published Sept. 21, 1833, and of seven later numbers of the series of ninety, was John Keble, also a Fellow of Oriel, and, since 1825, curate of Hursley, Hampshire, where he became vicar in 1835 and remained to the end of his life, 1866. He had published, in a first edition of 500 copies, in 1827, his *Christian Year*, two volumes of sacred lyrics, of which, before the copyright expired, 305,500 copies were sold. When he wrote his contributions to the Tracts, he was also connected with Oxford by a lectureship of Poetry. On July 14, 1833, he had preached a sermon at Oxford on *National Apostasy*, occasioned by the suppression of ten Irish bishoprics, and Newman, in his day, considered this sermon "the start of the religious Movement of 1833." The subject of Keble's first Tract was "Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the safest course." A third Fellow of Oriel who entered the ranks of the Tract-writers in 1833

was Richard Hurrell Froude, who, together with Newman, had that same year visited Wiseman at Rome, and there found that toward union with the Roman church "not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole."

But the brightest star of Oriel College and of the University in those and many subsequent days was Edward Bouverie Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; and before the expiration of 1833, he, too, had published his first contribution to the "Tracts for the Times."

That the leaders of the Movement were Oxford men, was significant in various ways. "Oxford," says Canon Overton, "had reached her nadir in the eighteenth century. Professors who never lectured, tutors who never taught, students who never studied, were the rule rather than the exception." The dawn of the nineteenth century brought better days for the English Universities. But the better part of the change might have seemed to have fallen to Cambridge. While the center of practical activity of the Evangelicals was Clapham, near London, where such men as Wilberforce, Thornton, Macaulay, and Venn, exerted their energies, the intellectual head-quarters of the party were at Cambridge, where Charles Simeon, Isaac Milner, Thomason, Farish, the Jowetts, Scholefield, and others, shaped the minds of the young men who flocked to Queen's or Magdalen College, or were sent there by societies because the religious climate there was considered more salubrious than that of the other University. Oxford was considered the Athens of High-church principles; "but," says a Provost of Oriel, "the leading partisans appear to me only occupied with the thought of converting the property of the Church to their private advantage, leaving the duties of it to be performed how they can." On the other hand, Liberalism had found its friends and promoters at Oxford, also among the Fellows of Oriel, the society which was at that time "the

centre of all the finest ability in Oxford." Under these circumstances, religious fanaticism, or a movement which would create a turmoil throughout the kingdom and stir schools and parishes and courts and the episcopal bench and the Houses of Parliament into violent commotion was probably the last thing to be expected from Oxford. And here came these Tracts like discharges of rapid-firing guns, in volleys or in quick succession, No. I, Sept. 9, No. II, Sept. 9, No. III, Sept. 9, No. IV, Sept. 21, No. V, Oct. 18, No. VI, Oct. 29, No. VII, Oct. 29, No. VIII, Oct. 31, No. IX, Oct. 31, No. X, Nov. 4, No. XI, Nov. 11, No. XII, Dec. 4, No. XIII, Dec. 5, No. XIV, Dec. 12, No. XV, Dec. 13, No. XVI, Dec. 17, No. XVII, Dec. 20, No. XVIII, Dec. 21, No. XIX, Dec. 23, No. XX, Dec. 24, 1833; No. XXI, Jan. 1, No. XXII, Jan. 6, No. XXIII, Jan. 6, etc. etc., giving the readers hardly time enough to get through with one day's delivery and to catch their breath before another charge would come crashing in upon them, *ad Clerum, ad Populum, ad Scholas*. If this was what he had in mind when, on his homeward journey from Rome, he said, "I have a work to do in England," Newman certainly had lost no time in getting down to business and was now at it with a will, and in a way which could not fail to attract attention far and wide. The doctrine of the Tracts was not new in the Anglican Church; but never before had it been so boldly and persistently propounded and advocated as in these leaflets and booklets. Besides, the discussion was not restricted to the Tracts; it "got into the papers." The periodical press opened its pages and columns to contributors *pro* and *contra*, and here, again, the "Tractarians" were not backward in keeping themselves before the public. Then there was the personal contact of the leaders with the young men at Oxford. "They heard," says Newman, "what I said in conversation, and told it to others. Undergraduates in due time took their degree, and became private tutors themselves. Others went down to the country, and became



curates of parishes. Then they had down from London parcels of the Tracts, and other publications. They placed them in the shops of local booksellers, got them into newspapers, introduced them to clerical meetings, and converted more or less their Rectors and their brother curates."

This underhand and underground way of operating was one of the characteristics of the Movement. As early as Aug. 31, shortly before Tract I appeared, Newman wrote to his friend, J. W. Bowden: "We are just setting up here Societies for the defence of the Church. We do not like our names known, but we hope the plan will succeed." To another close friend, F. Rogers, he wrote on the same day: "*Entre nous*, we have set up Societies over the kingdom in defence of the Church. Certainly this is, you will say, a singular confidential communication, being shared by so many; but the *entre nous* relates to *we*. We do not like our names known." Thus, also, in discharging their Tracts, the leaders used smokeless powder. In this secret way, another measure was planned and executed. In January, 1838, Newman wrote to Bowden, the author of Tract No. V: "Your offering towards the *young monks* was just like yourself, and I cannot pay you a better compliment. It will be most welcome. As you may suppose, we have nothing settled, but are feeling our way. We should begin next term; but since, *however secret* one may wish to keep it, things get out, we do not yet wish to commit young men to anything which may hurt their chance of success at any college in standing for a fellowship." A *coenobitium* was subsequently established at Oxford and, later on, moved to Littlemore. One of the members of the little community which Newman gathered about himself there, Lockhart, gives the following description of the life they led at the Monastery: "We had now arrived at the year 1842, when we took up residence with Newman at Littlemore. Father Dalgairns and myself were the first inmates. It was a kind of Monastic life of retirement, prayer, and study.

We had a sincere desire to remain in the Church of England, if we could be satisfied that in doing so we were members of the world-wide visible communion of Christianity which was of Apostolic origin. We spent our time at Littlemore in study, prayer, and fasting. We rose at midnight to recite the Breviary Office, consoling ourselves that we were united in prayer with united Christendom, and were using the very words used by the Saints of all ages. We fasted according to the practice recommended in Holy Scripture, and practiced in the most austere Religious Orders of Eastern and Western Christendom. We never broke our fast, except on Sundays and the Great Festivals, before 12 o'clock, and not until 5 o'clock in the Advent and Lenten seasons." F. C. Bowles, J. B. Dalgairns, Ambrose St. John, Rich. Stanton, Lockhart, Christie, all of whom afterwards seceded to the Roman church, had been inmates of Newman's House at Littlemore, which was abandoned when Newman himself went over to Rome.

The Romeward tendency of the Movement was an innate evil. In November, 1833, Newman wrote to a friend: "I expect to be called a Papist when my opinions are known. But (please God) I shall lead persons on a little way, while they fancy they are only taking the mean, and denounce me as the extreme." And his expectation was not long in being fulfilled, for one month later to the day, Dec. 22, writing to a lady, he said of a friend who called on him: "He . . . did not call me a Papist to my face, as some other persons have." In June, 1834, he complained, "My Tracts were abused as Popish." In 1839, he wrote to Manning: "I am conscious that we are raising longings and tastes which we are not allowed to supply; and till our Bishops and others give scope to the development of Catholicism externally and wisely, we do tend to make impatient minds seek it where it has ever been, in Rome." A few months later, Jan. 12, 1840, he said, in a letter to Bowden: "Things are progressing steadily, but breakers ahead! The danger

of lapse into Romanism, I think, gets stronger daily. I expect to hear of victims." A few weeks later he wrote to the same friend: "Pusey is at present eager about setting up Sisters of Mercy. I feel sure that such institutions are the only means of saving some of our best members from turning Roman Catholics."

A bold stroke intended to justify Romanism within the Anglican Church as a matter of course was the publication of Newman's Tract No. XC, early in 1841. It was a pamphlet of 83 pages and bore the title, "Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles." The Articles on which it laid stress were XXII and XXXI. Keble had seen it in proof and recommended it for publication. The object of Tract XC was, as the introduction stated, to show that "while our Prayer-book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed to by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine."

This audacious attempt to make people in the Anglican Church consider or feel themselves in full accord with Rome on some of the chief points of false doctrine and worship called forth loud protests from various quarters. At Oxford, the University was called into action. In a letter bearing the signatures of "Four Tutors," and dated March 8, 1841, the Tract was denounced in the following terms: "The tract has, in our apprehension, a highly dangerous tendency, from its suggestion that certain very important errors of the Church of Rome are not condemned by the Articles of the Church of England: for instance, that those Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines,

1. Of Purgatory,
2. Of Pardons,
3. Of the Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics,
4. Of the Invocation of Saints,
5. Of the Mass,



as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome, but only of certain absurd practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do. . . . If we are right in our apprehension of the author's meaning, we are at a loss to see what security would remain, were his principles generally recognized, that the most plainly erroneous doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome might not be inculcated in the lecture-rooms of the University and from the pulpits of our churches.' On March 12, after a previous meeting on the 10th, the Heads of Houses were assembled, 21 of the 26 members of the Board being present. By a vote of 19 to 2 it was resolved to censure the Tract, and a manifesto published on the morning of March 16, said "that modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of the errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned statutes." Bishop Bagot of Oxford, too, though he had been remarkable indulgent toward the Tractarians, now saw the time come when he must interfere, and it was ordained that the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" should be discontinued.

One by one the bishops came forth against the Movement, and their words were followed up by corresponding action. Thus the Bishop of Winchester refused ordination to the priesthood to Keble's curate, Peter Young.

All these and other measures, however, could not stem the current which had been allowed too long to have its way. In its issue of March 6, 1841, the *London Times* said: "Their teaching has now sunk deeply into the heart of the Church of England, it has acquired not only a numerical, but a moral power and influence, which must henceforth make it impossible for any statesman to despise and overlook, and highly indiscreet for any political party unnecessarily to alienate, this element in the constitution of

society. The younger clergy are said to be very generally of this school; it has no want of advocates among their seniors; it has penetrated into both Houses of Parliament, and we are confidently informed (we suppose, therefore, on some foundation) that it has met with countenance from Bishops themselves."

As the Movement continued, the waters kept on seeking their level. In 1842 several cases of secession to Rome occurred. On Sept. 4 of that year, Doellinger wrote to Pusey: "From all these writings I retain such an impression that I feel almost inclined to call out: '*Tales cum sitis, jam nostri estis*,' or if you like it better thus: '*Tales cum sitis, jam vestri sumus!*'" In Rome, also, the English developments were hailed with delight. Newman, who had written some hard truths concerning the Papacy, toward the close of the year wrote a "Retractation," which he published early in 1843, and in which he recanted what he said of Rome as "a lost church," of the "cause of Antichrist" to which, he had feared, the Council of Trent had bound the Roman Communion; that Rome was "infested with heresy," that in the seat of St. Peter "the evil spirit had throned himself and ruled." Some days before this recantation was published in London, Newman wrote to a friend: "My conscience goaded me some two months since to an act which comes into effect, I believe, in the *Conservative Journal* next Saturday viz., to eat a few dirty words of mine." In August of that year, a young man who had been with Newman at Littlemore for a year, Lockhart, took his departure for the Church of Rome. On September 1, Newman wrote to Mozley: "The truth is, I am not a good son enough of the church of England to feel that I can in conscience hold preferment under her. I love the Church of Rome too well." He resigned the Vicarage of St. Mary's on September 18 and preached his last sermon at Littlemore on September 25. Soon after, Rev. Seager, who had for four years been Pusey's assistant lecturer in Hebrew, and whom

Pusey had again appointed to lecture in the Hebrew classes, just before the opening of the October term, joined the church of Rome. In December, when Pusey contemplated a translation and publication of the Breviary, Newman, in reply to a letter in which Pusey had asked his opinion on the plan, said:—"I am quite of the opinion that any Breviary, however corrected etc., will tend to prepare minds for the Church of Rome. I fully think that you will be doing so by your publication.... Did I wish to promote the cause of the Church of Rome, I should say, Do what you propose to do.... My dislike of approximating Rome has diminished with my hope of avoiding her. Now, as before, I am not unwilling that Breviaries should be published—though for different reasons. But as I have tried, while I had a charge in our church to do nothing against her, so now you should have my opinion on the subject."

Even as late as Nov. 14, 1844, Pusey wrote to Prebendary Henderson: "You are quite right in thinking that N. has no feelings drawing him away from us: all his feelings and sympathies have been for our Church." On Feb. 25, 1845, Newman wrote to Pusey:—"My dear Pusey, please do not disguise from yourself, that, as far as such outward matters go, I am as much gone over as if I *were already gone*. It is a matter of time only. I am waiting." And now, at last, Pusey prepared his mind for the blow which Newman's secession would be to him, and his attitude toward the coming event is truly remarkable. It appears from a letter of March 21, 1845, to the Rev. H. A. Woodgate, in which he said: "He has done all he could to keep himself where he is, but his convictions are too strong for him, and so now my only hope is that he may be an instrument to restore the Roman Church, since our church knows not how to employ him.... Besides those already unsettled, hundreds will be carried from us, mistrusting themselves to stay when he goes."

On October 3, Newman wrote to Pusey: "I have writ-



ten to the Provost to-day to resign my Fellowship. Anything may happen to me now any day."

On October 9, Father Dominic, the Passionist, was at Littlemore, and Newman crossed the line, another renegade to Rome.

When Newman took his leave from the Church of England to go where a Cardinal's hat was in store for him, the head leadership of the Tractarian Movement had long since passed from him to the man who thenceforth for nearly half a century stood at the head of the High-church party in England, Edward Bouverie Pusey. Of his significance as a scholar we must not here endeavor to speak at length. Suffice it to say that also in this respect he stood second to no man at Oxford. He had put the years spent at German Universities to excellent advantage, and with studious habits, great natural talents and an astounding capacity for hard work he continued to lay by stores of knowledge which placed him in the first rank among the scholars of the century. From the time when, at the age of twenty-eight years, he was, in 1828 appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew by the duke of Wellington, to the end of his life, in 1882, there was hardly an important event in the University, in the Church, and in the State, upon which he did not exert a determining influence. From the sermon for which he was, without a hearing, suspended for three years from preaching in the University pulpit, and which, in consequence, was sold in 18,000 copies, each or nearly every University sermon he delivered marked an epoch in the history of the Church of England. The *Library of the Fathers*, of which he was very much what Flacius was to the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, and his Commentaries on Daniel and the Minor Prophets, were works which alone would have sufficed to secure for his name a prominent place in the history of Theology. Small wonder that a Movement into which this man entered heart and soul came to be known as the Puseyite Movement throughout the civilized world.

It is not without significance that in the letter of thanks by which he acknowledged his appointment to the Professorship of Hebrew, Pusey, by a slip of the pen which seems to have passed unnoticed at the time, expressed his gratitude for his appointment as Regius Professor of *Divinity*, though that professorship had its incumbent. He looked upon his work in the University as theological work, though at a time he was told that he was a Professor of Language. His writings, the titles of which, in their various editions, cover 50 pages, are, with very few exceptions, theological. And to understand the nature of the Movement of which he became and remained so prominent a leader, we must learn to know Pusey as a theologian.

The cardinal doctrine in Pusey's theology was the doctrine of the Church and the Ministry, and here, also, lay his ruling error. On the one hand, the "Church Catholic" was to him the authoritative teacher in matters of faith, whose definitions are binding upon the conscience of the individual. In a letter to Tholuck, of Nov. 19, 1839, he says: "The main question is a practical one, and one of great moral moment; it is this: Is a person in duty bound to accept what the Church Catholic has pronounced to be a matter of faith or no? Is it e. g. a person's duty to receive the articles of the Nicene Creed, on the authority of the Church, whether *he* can prove them by Scripture or no, or even if he think that Scripture goes rather against any one? Our great divines, and we after them, say, Yes, *Crede ut intelligas*."

But the Church to which the deposit of the faith was delivered is not, according to Pusey, the Church, the whole number of believers. He says: "The deposit of the faith, and the guardianship of discipline and of ritual, was, you know, delivered by the Apostles to the Bishops, and in their degree to Presbyters. It was not given to laity, because they are sheep, not shepherds, as one Emperor says." When, in 1852, the proposal of admitting laymen to Convocation

was discussed, Pusey wrote to Keble:—"I look with terror to any admission of laity into *Synods*. It at once invests them with an ecclesiastical office, which will develop itself sooner or later, I believe, to the destruction of the Faith." And to Mr. Gladstone: "Such a synod is not of Divine institution, and so, I suppose, we could not look for the Presence of God the Holy Ghost in it. Synods of Bishops are Apostolic. If such a plan were adopted, I believe *actum esset de Ecclesia Anglicana*." And to Dr. Skinner, Lord B. of Aberdeen and Primus of Scotland: "If the Church of the United States has admitted the laity to a voice in deciding on matters of faith, I believe that her Bishops have abandoned a trust committed to them, and, sooner or later, they must suffer by it. . . . I do most entirely think that 'the Constitution' of the American Church is based neither on warrant of Holy Scripture, nor of the Church, down to itself. I believe that it introduced a new principle."

Upon the Episcopate, as by apostolic succession, Pusey also based the validity of the sacraments and the power of the keys. In a letter to a lady, he wrote on March 2, 1846:—"Having the Apostolic Succession, we have the Sacraments, and being neither heretics nor schismatics, we have their grace with the power of the keys." In 1842 he urged as one of the reasons against a union of Anglicans and Lutherans that the former "hold Ordination to be derived from the Apostles," the latter, "that Presbyters, uncommissioned, may confer it, and that those on whom it has been so conferred may consecrate the Holy Eucharist." How this false assumption of the bearing of apostolic ordination on the validity and efficacy of the means of grace affects the personal faith of the individual Christian, was exemplified in Pusey's own family. During the latter years of her life, his wife was much distressed by doubts as to the validity of her baptism, which had not been performed by an Anglican priest or bishop, but by a dissenter. The question was to

her and Pusey whether, to make sure of the validity of her baptism, it would be well to rebaptize her conditionally, and, after two years of hesitation, she was thus rebaptized by Newman on Easter Eve, April 14, 1838, the sanction of the Bishop having been previously sought and obtained.

Pusey's doctrine of the Church and the Ministry, in its close kinship with the Romanist doctrine, is thus seen to vitiate also, and in the same direction, his doctrine of the means of grace. This further appears when we hear such utterances as these. On December 10, 1836, Pusey wrote to J. F. Russell, Esq.: "Confirmation is not simply taking upon oneself the vows made for one in infancy, but also a channel of grace through the ordinance of God. It, as well as orders, differs from the two great Sacraments in that these directly unite us with Christ, but both it and orders are means of grace to the worthy receiver."

Especially was Pusey's doctrine of the Lord's Supper in various ways unscriptural. His emphatic maintenance of the Real Presence has led many, also Lutherans, who knew Pusey's doctrine either from hearsay or from a superficial survey of his writings, to believe and say that Pusey and the Puseyites, and the Ritualists of to-day, held Lutheran views of the Eucharist. But Pusey's notions of the Sacrament were essentially Roman, as are those of the Ritualists to-day. He looked upon the Eucharist as a sacrifice, by which Christ's body and blood, even the whole Christ, present upon the altar in the form of bread and wine, were offered for the quick and the dead. He taught that in this form Christ must be adored by the church, and, rejecting the Lutheran doctrine of the chief purpose and benefit of the sacrament as a seal of divine grace and the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, made the direct union of the communicant with Christ the distinctive eucharistic blessing. In a letter of April 18, 1852, to the Bishop of Oxford he said: "Having gone fully into this, I thought of not going, with the same fullness, into the doctrine of the Eucharistic



Sacrifice, because it depends upon this. If there were no real Sacramental Presence of our Lord's Blessed Body and Blood, there would be nothing to offer and plead before Almighty God, except the outward symbols of an absent Thing. Since Holy Scripture (as taken most literally, and that meaning confirmed by the Fathers) speaks of a real, actual, Sacramental Presence, then we offer to God on the 'Altar' which Holy Scripture speaks of as belonging to Christians only (Heb.) the 'pure offering' of which the prophet Malachi speaks." In the "Protest" framed by Pusey against the decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury in the case of *Ditcher v. Denison*, and signed by Pusey and seventeen others, in 1856, the appellants say, "that the practice of worshipping Christ then and there especially present, after consecration and before communicating, has been common throughout the Church." Newman, who was thoroughly familiar with Pusey's view of the Lord's supper, wrote to him in 1836: "As to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist, I do not see that you can find fault with the formal wording of the Tridentine decree."

Nor was this the only point of agreement between Pusey's theology and that of the Tridentine Canons. On January 1, 1850, Pusey wrote to Archdeacon Manning, who was then getting ready to secede to Romanism and had asked Pusey whether he could accept the Decrees of the Council of Trent: "What I felt before comes out fully to me again, on reading it as a whole, that it is so manifestly not directed against us. Indeed, as you know well historically, it was taken up with the errors of Luther chiefly. There are his very words." And in a letter to the *Weekly Register* dated Dec. 6, 1865, Pusey said: "On comparing my belief with that expressed by the Council of Trent, I thought that its terms, as explained by some individual doctors, yet of authority among you, did not condemn what I believed, and did not require me to believe what I did not believe. I thought that the Council of Trent so explained

for the Church of England, might be a basis of union. If I may sum up briefly, I think that not only on the whole range of doctrine, on the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation, but also on Original Sin and Justification, and all the doctrines of grace, there is nothing to be explained; that on the Canon of Scripture, the Holy Eucharist, and the Anointing of the sick, there is what has to be mutually explained; that on what I suppose you will account points of lesser magnitude, as those alluded to in our XXII Article, there will be need not only of explanation, but of limitation, what is to be *de fide*." The reader will note that Pusey, according to these statements, was ready to accept, even without explanation, the teaching of Trent on "Justification and all the doctrines of grace," and that in opposition to "the errors of Luther."

This may be the proper place to add a word or two on Pusey's attitude toward Lutheranism in general. In a letter to Newman of Aug. 9, 1841, he says: "I suppose that until one saw the development of Calvinism and Lutheranism into Rationalism, people would not venture to see them in their true light. . . . Our Reformation has had, amid whatever reverses, a steady tendency to develop itself into Catholicism, and to throw out the impure elements which came into the Church; the foreign Reformation has developed the contrary way into Rationalism and Pantheism; and therefore I think we have a right to infer that there was a difference in their original *ἡθος*—ours intrinsically Catholic, though with something un-Catholic cleaving to the agents in it, theirs intrinsically un-Catholic, though with some semblance of Catholicism."

In 1841, the first Anglo-Prussian Bishop of Jerusalem, M. S. Alexander, was consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of London, Rochester, and New Zealand. Against this arrangement, which was indeed objectionable for valid reasons which we need not here specify, the Tractarians entered their protests. Newman objected

to an alliance with the German Protestants because Lutheranism as well as Calvinism had been condemned as heresies both by the East and by the West. Pusey in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, said: "Still less, I own, can I see, even if your Grace were advised, or it were lawful, to free the Bishop from these obligations by which he is at present bound,—how the picture of a United Church could be presented by an English and a Lutheran congregation, of which the one hold 'One Holy Catholic Church, throughout all the world,' knit together by its Bishops, as 'joints and bands,' under its one Head, Christ, and joined on by unbroken succession to the Apostles; the other, an infinite number of Churches, hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves, and modified by the civil power; of which the one holds Confirmation to be the act of the Bishop, the other deems such unnecessary, but accepts it for its younger members: the one holds Ordination to be derived from the Apostles, the other that Presbyters, uncommissioned, may confer it, and that those on whom it has been so conferred may consecrate the Holy Eucharist: the one recites the Creed of Nicea, the other has laid it aside: in the one, ancient prayers, the inspired Psalms, and hearing God's Word, are the chief part of their weekly service; in the other, uninspired hymns and preaching, with prayer extempore: the one kneel in prayer, the other not even in the Holy Eucharist: with the one, the Lord's Day is a Holy Day, with the other a holyday: the one receives 'the faith' as 'once for all delivered to the saints;' the other, as susceptible of subsequent correction and development: the one rests her authority and the very titles of her existence on being an Ancient Church, the other boasts itself modern: the one not founded by man, but descended of that founded on the day of Pentecost; the other dating itself from Luther." Many years later, in his work on the "Real Presence," first published in 1857, Pusey openly accused Luther of heresy, and it may be safely said

that he was only consistent in rejecting Lutheranism as a whole and all the distinctive doctrines which separate us from Rome for ever.

Again, Pusey was only consistent when, in 1865, he wrote to the *Weekly Register*: — "We readily recognize the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome; the bearings of that Primacy on other local churches, we believe to be a matter of ecclesiastical, not of Divine law; but neither is there anything in the Supremacy in itself to which we should object." During his second visit to France to interview Roman Catholic bishops with a view of promoting the reunion, Pusey wrote from Pau, Jan. 10, 1866: "I have had three very happy interviews. I do not like to name names, but one very eminent Theologian ended a discussion of one and a half to two hours in which I spoke freely, with a kiss of peace, owning me as a true brother; and an Archbishop, whom I had not before seen, did the same twice, after my asking him for and having his benediction." Such, then, according to Pusey's own account, was his theology, that after hours of discussion it was by an eminent Romanist theologian recognized by a kiss of peace.

And his practice was in many ways in conformity with his doctrine. For Newman's apostasy, while it certainly gave him much pain, he had not a word of censure. In the published correspondence we find not a line whereby he had attempted to dissuade or warn his friend when he was about to take the final step. In June, 1844, Ward, one of the agitators of the Cause among the young men at Oxford, published his *Ideal of a Christian Church*, in which he said: "Three years have passed, since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman doctrine." The authorities of the University opened procedure against the author; propositions to be placed before the next Convocation were published, and in February, 1845, Ward's book was condemned by a majority of 391 votes, and by a majority of 58 votes, the author was degraded



from his University degrees. Pusey in both cases voted with the minority. On the other hand, he was prompt in his disapproval of what he considered undue severity against Rome. While Ward's book was giving widespread offense, and Pusey had no word of rebuke, he wrote to Dr. Hook, on Nov. 24, 1844: "I am frightened at your calling Rome Antichrist, or a forerunner of it. I believe Antichrist will be infidel and arise out of what calls itself Protestantism, and then Rome and England will be united in one to oppose it. Protestantism is infidel, or verging towards it as a whole."

To the same correspondent, Pusey had written in 1842: "I suppose the general neglect of *fasting*, until of late, has fostered this want of severity: but Catholic truth will never strike deep root in the Church without it. It is what we still most want." That he was "eager about setting up Sisters of Mercy" has already been quoted, and the time came when he had his sisterhood and heard confession there, and in 1850, Bishop Wilberforce, who had his eye on him, wrote to him: "You seem to me to be habitually assuming the place and doing the work of a Roman Confessor, and not that of an English clergyman." In 1851 he wrote and printed for private circulation his *Hints for a First Confession*, in which he taught that "the forgiveness is conditional upon the completeness of the Confession." He advocated prayers for the dead as early as 1836. When he proposed to build, at his own expense, a new church for Leeds, he made it a first condition that it should bear the inscription, "Ye who enter this holy place pray for the sinner who built it." Before the dedication of the church, which was named St. Saviour's, he ordered altar plate as a gift of his dying daughter Lucy, and looked for some prayer to be engraved on the vessels, one which might be looked upon as the prayer of the individual and which yet others might use. "Any one," he wrote, "who habitually prayed for the departed would repeat such a prayer." He thought

of such a form as, "*Propitius esto, Domine, Luciae Mariae — —*"

The clergy of St. Saviour's, appointed by Pusey, soon gave serious offence, so that Dr. Hook, also of Leeds, bitterly complained of Pusey that he had planted a colony of Papists in the heart of Leeds. A sermon preached on All Saints' Day, 1846, on the "Intercession of the Saints," by one of the curates, caused complaint to be made to the Bishop of Ripon. Before five years had passed, all the clergy of St. Saviour's connected with the church in 1851, with one exception, seceded to the Church of Rome. For their reception Newman, then Superior of Oratorians at Birmingham, came over to Leeds and preached on Gamaliel's counsel, and the renegades, though no longer in St. Saviour's, set up their traps in the parish to make converts to Rome.

In those days the antagonism between High-church and Low-church had been sharpened by two cases which had been contested by the High-church men and decided against them. The first case was that of Dr. Hampden, who was, in 1836, appointed to the vacant chair of Regius Professor of Divinity. Against this appointment, the Tractarians and others had remonstrated, and arguments ran high on both sides. Hampden's opponents impugned his orthodoxy, and, unable to oust him from his professorship, they succeeded in passing a statute by the Convocation depriving the Regius Professor of Divinity of the right of sitting at the Board of Inquiry into Heretical Doctrines and at the Board of Nomination of Select Preachers at the University. But in 1847 Dr. Hampden was, by the Prime Minister, appointed to the vacant Bishopric of Hereford. This was looked upon by both sides as a move of the Low-church against the High-church element, and in spite of the energetic opposition, of which Pusey was considered "the leader and oracle," Hampden was consecrated at Lambeth on March 26, 1848.

While this case was still pending, another affair turned up, known as the "Gorham Case." A certain Mr. Gorham was, in November, 1847, presented to the vicarage of Brampford Speke. Suspicion of unsound doctrine being raised, Gorham was examined and found to deny the regenerating power of Baptism. Thereupon the Bishop of Exeter refused to institute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Brampford Speke. An appeal was taken to the Arches Court of Canterbury, and thence, as the Bishop had been sustained by the court, Gorham took his case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the supreme court of appeal in ecclesiastical cases. The court consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and seven lay judges. The main point to be decided was whether the Articles and Formularies of the Anglican Church taught Baptismal regeneration and Mr. Gorham, denying this doctrine, was a heretic. When, on March 8, 1850, the decision of the court came down, it was that the opinions of Mr. Gorham were "not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England as by law established, and that Mr. Gorham ought not, by reason of the doctrine held by him, to have been refused admission to the vicarage of Brampford Speke." The Bishop of Exeter tried this way and that to have the judgment of the court annulled, but failed as he expected, and on August 6, 1850, in spite of the Bishop's solemn protest, Mr. Gorham was instituted by order of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Before and after this act, protests and remonstrances came pouring in thick and fast, from individuals, from private meetings and public meetings, ten petitions to the Crown, twenty to the Archbishop of Canterbury, ten to the Bishop of London, twenty to the Bishop of Exeter, six to the Bishop of Ripon, others to other Bishops, a declaration signed by 45 Fellows and teachers of Oxford, utterances of the London Church Union and the Bristol Church Union, and all to no avail. Beyond the judgment of the Judicial

Committee the propriety of the jurisdiction of that court was attacked; but the judgment stood and the court continued to hold and exercise jurisdiction. The campaign had resulted in a defeat of the party which had, again, fought under the leadership of Prof. Pusey, the adviser of the Bishop of Exeter and numerous clergymen, the framer of Declarations, the speaker in public meetings, the writer of numerous letters, and of a book on the "Royal Supremacy" composed in carriages and railway coaches and amid the labors of his study. And as, where there is war, there will be dead and wounded, the losses of the Anglican Church by secession to Rome were multiplied at this stage of the struggle within the English establishment. Among these seceders there were two prominent signers of a "Declaration on the Royal Supremacy in Matters ecclesiastic," Archdeacon Manning, who was afterwards made a Roman Archbishop and Cardinal, and Archdeacon Wilberforce, who died before he could be re-ordained to Roman Orders, both of whom fell away to Romanism in spite of Pusey's endeavors to hold them.

The Gorham Case marks an epoch in the Catholic Movement. It was followed by what may be fitly called the period of association and organization. During this period a number of societies, largely secret, came into being, having for their common aim the Corporate Union with the Church of Rome.

The Society of the Holy Cross was founded by Joseph N. Smith and five others on February 28, 1855. It is a secret society, and its members are pledged to secrecy. Among the signs of recognition a peculiar cross worn on the watch-chain or on the breast, a form of salutation and certain forms used in opening and closing letters between the members, are known. The synods are secret meetings held in May and September, with doors locked. The following provisions from the Statutes may serve to indicate the character of the society. "Before the holding of any



Synod Mass shall be Celebrated solemnly, with a short Sermon from a Brother, and the *Officium Proprium* shall be said." (Ch. VI, sec. 4.) "When the Synod shall extend over two days, a Mass shall be said for the Departed Brethren on the second day, in a Church selected by the Master" (sec. 5). "The Brethren shall be strictly forbidden to divulge the proceedings of the Synods and Chapters, except so far as the publication is authorized by the Society" (Ch. VI, sec. 24). "There are four progressive degrees of obligation in the Society, termed respectively, the Ordinary, the Green, the Red, and the White Rule. The Ordinary Rule is binding upon all the Brethren and Probationers. The other three are entirely voluntary, but recommended for adoption; the White Rule being restricted to Celibates" (Ch. X, sec. 1). The vow of the Celibates, made in Latin, is, in English: "I, N—, profess and promise to Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and to all the Saints, that I will lead a life of Celibacy for . . . [stating the number of years or the rest of his life]. So help me God!" The regulations for the "White Rule" say that the Celibates must say Mass daily, frequent the Sacrament of Penance at least monthly, say daily an office for each of the Hours, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, or Vespers, and Compline, and make a Retreat each year (Ch. XVI). "The Brethren shall devote themselves diligently to the Science of the Care of Souls and shall labor in bringing young and old who are under their influence to value duly the Sacrament of Penance." "Upon the death of a Brother, notice thereof shall be given to the Secretary, as soon as possible, by any Brother cognizant of it, and the Secretary shall, forthwith, inform the Brethren, that they may say Mass for the soul of their Brother, either on the day of the funeral, or as soon after as practicable" (Ch. II, sec. 9).

In 1862, a society was founded which assumed the name of the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament." It is composed of Bishops, priests, laymen and women, and in

1894, no less than 1682 clergymen and 13,444 laymen and women were members of this "daughter of the Society of the Holy Cross." Its objects, according to the *Manual*, are: "1. The Honor due to the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood. 2. Mutual and special Intercession at the time of and in union with the Eucharistic Sacrifice. 3. To promote the observance of the Catholic and primitive practice of receiving the Holy Communion fasting." In other words, the aim of this Sodality is the establishment of the Romanist *Mass* in the Church of England. The *Manual* also recommends "to make Offerings for the due and reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist," that is, to pay for Masses. To offer prayers for the dead is made a duty of every member. In the *Suggestions for the due and reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist*, the following prayer is prescribed:—"Receive, O Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, this pure Oblation, which I, Thy unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, the Living and true God, for my numberless sins, offences and negligences; for all who are here present, as also for all faithful Christians, living and departed, that it may avail to our salvation unto life eternal. Amen." The subjects for which prayer and thanksgiving should be offered are specified in the *Intercession Paper* published monthly for the Confraternity and secretly distributed among its members. The anniversaries of the Society are held on Corpus Christi Day. In a sermon preached at one of these celebrations, Canon Gore said: "Christ is present in the Eucharist indeed externally to us, objectively and really; He is present as the Bread of Life, the Sacrifice for sins, the Object of worship. He is present wherever the consecrated elements are." In a paper read in 1871, the Rev. A. L. Lewington said: "When we say that the Presence of Christ is objective, we understand that It is there without communion as with communion, abiding under the outward and Visible Form in the consecrated Elements, so

long as the consecrated Elements are unconsumed." The preacher at the "Solemn Requiem," Nov. 10, 1890, said: "The souls in Paradise are offering the homage of their spiritual sufferings in the realms of Purgatory, and are helped by our prayers and Eucharistic offerings on their behalf."

A Ritualistic society which even more expressly makes the doctrine of Purgatory and the practice connected therewith its special object is "The Guild of All Souls," which was founded in 1873 and has its branches spread over England and in Scotland, the United States, Canada, Australia, Madras, Prince Edward Island, Barbados, Port Elizabeth. A secret quarterly *Intercession Paper* gives the names of those departed souls for whom intercession is asked and the churches where these Masses for the Dead are to be held, and the *annual Report* of the Guild for 1895 stated that "During November, in addition to those on All Souls' Day, there were 991 Special Requiem Masses in connection with the Guild, and the regular Requiem Masses maintained throughout the year are now, at least, 480 each month." In his sermon preached for the Guild of All Souls on All Souls' Day, 1883, the preacher, H. Lloyd Russell, said: "We believe that the mercy and justice of God in his dealings with their souls are reconciled by their being detained for a certain time in a middle place, there to be punished, and purified, and dealt with, according to His good pleasure, until He sees fit to admit them to the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision." Another preacher to the Guild, in 1889, said: "God, even in the Fire, shall be known to be their Father, burning all the falsehood and revealing the truth. Therefore let us join together now in offering the Sacrifice of the Mass for all departed Souls."

Another secret Ritualistic Society is the "Order of Corporate Reunion," a society admitting both sexes. The *Civiltà Cattolica*, in its issue of April 20, 1878, published a letter from its English correspondent, who wrote: "The

Order of Corporate Reunion actively pursues its labors, and its officers have sent forth a Pastoral Letter containing an exposition of its views and ends. It is known that several Anglican ministers in connection with this Society have induced a Greek Bishop—whose name, however, it has not yet been possible to ascertain—to ordain them under certain conditions, in order that the doubt to which Anglican Orders are subject may not be alleged as a reason for taking exception to the validity of their operations. . . . So soon as a sufficient number of the Anglican Clergy shall have in this way removed the difficulty which arises from their ordination, the Order hopes to be able to present its petition for Corporate Reunion with the Catholic Church, signed by a number of members so imposing as to render it impossible for the Holy See not to recognize the gravity and importance of the movement.” In 1881, Dr. F. G. Lee, Vicar of All Saints’, Lambeth, supposed to be one of the mysterious Bishops of the Order, published an article in which he stated that “Already there are representatives of the O. C. R. in almost every English diocese.” And in 1894, the Roman *Catholic Standard and Ransomer*, a paper edited by a former Anglican Ritualist, said: “We have heard just lately that there are now *eight hundred* clergymen of the Church of England who have been *validly* ordained by Dr. Lee and his co-Bishops of the Order of Corporate Reunion. If so, Dr. Lee’s dream of providing a body with which the Pope could deal seems likely to be realized.” In the Pastoral Letter referred to by the *Civiltà Cattolica*, the principles of the Order are defined as follows:—“In thus associating ourselves together we solemnly take as the basis of this Our Order the Catholic Faith as defined by the Seven General Councils acknowledged as such by the whole Church of the East and the West before the great and deplorable schism, and as commonly received in the Apostles’ Creed, and the Creed of Nicaea, and the Creed of St. Athanasius. To all the sublime doctrines so



laid down, We declare our unreserved adhesion, as well as to the principles of Church constitution and discipline, set forth and approved by the said Seven General Councils. Furthermore, until the whole Church shall speak on the subject, We accept all those dogmatic statements set forth in common by the Council of Trent and the Synod of Bethlehem respectively, with regard to the doctrine of the Sacraments." And one of the three Bishops named in this Pastoral, "Laurentius, O. C. R., Provincial of Caerleon," says in behalf of the Order: "It is quite true that we do not assume an attitude of independence toward the Holy See. We frankly acknowledge that, in the Providence of God, the Roman Pontiff is the first Bishop in the Church, and, therefore, its visible Head on earth."

The "Order of the Holy Redeemer" is another secret society of Ritualists "working within the Church of England under Episcopal approval." In the "Declaration" which is required of the Postulants for Admission to this Order the candidates profess their maintenance of the Seven Sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, Orders, Matrimony, Penance, and Extreme Unction. They declare "that in the Holy Eucharist a true and propitiatory Sacrifice is offered for the faithful, both living and dead," and that "the position of the Bishop of Rome is that of Archbishop of all the Churches." Within this Confraternity there is an inner circle, called the "Brotherhood of the Holy Cross," the very existence of which, according to its "Manual," is "to be kept in strict secrecy," and one of whose "recommended books" is the *Glories of Mary*, by "St." Alphonsus Liguori. A Rule of this Order requires, "That Brethren shall be faithful members of the Anglican Church."

The "Society of St. Osmund" was established in 1889. In the list of its Vice Presidents printed in 1895 it has the names of the Bishop of Bloemfontein, the Bishop of Pretoria, and the Bishop of Cairo, Ill., who, at its anniversary

of 1894 "offered up" the Holy Eucharist. Its *Ceremonial of the Altar* prescribes the following form: "I confess to God, to Blessed Mary, to all the Saints, and to you, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, by my fault. I beg Holy Mary, all the Saints of God, and you to pray for me." The *Mirror of Our Lady* says: "When all other succour faileth, Our Lady's grace helpeth. Complaine is the end of the day; and in the end of our life we have most need of our Lady's help, and therefore in all these hours we ought to do her worship and praising;" and: "It is reasonable that seven times each day she be worshipped and praised." Here is, also, a part of the Ritual for the "Adoration of the Holy Cross" from the *Services of Holy Week*:

"Then the Priests, uncovering the Cross by the right of the Altar, shall sing this Antiphon:—

"Behold the Holy Cross, on which the Savior of the world did hang for us. O come and let us worship.

"The choir: genuflecting, reply:—

"Antiphon, We venerate Thy Cross, O Lord."

"Then the clerks shall proceed to venerate the Cross, with feet unshod, beginning with the Senior."

"When this is done, the Cross shall be solemnly carried through the midst of the choir by the two aforesaid priests, the Candlebearers preceding them, and shall be set down before some Altar, where it shall be venerated by the people."

On Palm Sunday, flowers and leaves, which have been exorcised with Sprinkling of Holy Water, are distributed, and the Rubric of the *Services* says: "When the Palms are being distributed, a shrine with relics shall be made ready, in which shall hang in a Pyx the Host; and two clerks, not joining the procession to the first station, shall come to meet it at the place of the first station." A service for "Blessing the Fire" is provided for "Easter Eve." "Holy Water" and "Frankincense" are used. After the "Blessing

of the Paschal Candle" the "Litany of the Saints" is sung. Here is a part of it:

"Holy Mary, pray for us.  
Holy Mother of God, Pray.  
Holy Michael, Pray.  
St. Peter, Pray.  
All ye holy Apostles and  
Evangelists, Pray.  
St. Gregory, Pray.  
St. Sixtus, Pray.  
St. Dennis with his com-  
panions, Pray.  
St. Augustine, Pray.  
St. Agnes, Pray.  
All Saints, Pray."

In the *Ceremonial and Offices connected with the Burial of the Dead* printed in the *Transactions of the Society of St. Osmund*, payment for Masses *pro defunctis* is advocated thus:

"One of the most distressing things I know of in the Anglican Church is the difficulty of getting a priest to say Mass for some departed friend or relation, because when asked he will tell you he does not like being paid for Sacraments, etc.; but surely this is a prudish line to take—the 'laborer is worthy of his hire'—and as St. Paul said, 'They which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar.'

"Let priests then awaken to a greater sense of duty in this respect, and the great work of charity they have the power of bestowing, and remember that in accepting an Honorarium for a Mass they are not receiving a fee, but an offering."

It seems that the Society of St. Osmund has been continued in the form of the "Alcuin Club," in 1897, of which, among other prominent men, "the Bishops of Oxford, Salisbury, and Edinburgh," have been announced as members.

Besides these larger societies, there are in existence numerous sodalities of a more local character, "Guilds" of

men, of "boys," of "girls and young women," all of them Romanizing in their ways and means, educating persons of all classes and ages by doctrine and practice in the same direction. Among the "Things to be Remembered" by the boys of the "Guild of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," the list mentions this: "At the Consecration, immediately the Sanctus Bell rings, everybody should bow down and worship Jesus, Who is then present on the Altar, under the Form of Bread and Wine." The *Manual of the Tertiaries of Reparation to Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament* contains the Rules of the Order, a "Litany of Reparation," the Office of Benediction, a Litany of Our Lady, a Litany of the Incarnation, and fourteen hymns—half of them addressed to *Our Lady*, and half to the Blessed Sacrament. "Sacramental Confession" is enjoined, medals and crosses are sprinkled with Holy Water; the "Hail Mary" (*Ave Maria*) is prescribed, and the Tertiaries sing:

"Queen of Heaven, Queen of earth,  
Mistress of the Church of Christ,  
Mother of our second birth—

Pray for us, O Mother dear."

The *Manual of the Church Fraternity* requires the members to profess that "in the Great Eucharistic Sacrifice" we "obtain His Grace for ourselves and the whole world, pardon for all our sins, and that the faithful departed may rest in peace safe in the arms of Jesus," and that "under either kind alone Jesus is received whole and entire" in the Eucharist, thus inculcating also the Roman doctrine of concomitance and the practice of the *communio sub una*. There is even a "Railway Guild of the Holy Cross" intended for railroad men, but including also "Clerical Associates" and "Women Associates," whose names, however, as a rule, are "not for publication."

The reader has, by this time, a fairly approximate notion of what Ritualism is in the Anglican Church. Its



Romeward tendency appears on its face, and it has not taken this direction, so to say, by a turn of the road, but its compass has pointed that way from the beginning. After the secession at Leeds, Manning wrote to Pusey, Jan. 23, 1847:—"You know how long I have to you openly expressed my conviction that a false position has been taken up in the Church of England. The direct and certain tendency, I believe, of what remains of the original Movement is to the Roman Church." In a letter evidently coming from Pusey and Bishop Forbes, though in the latter's name and directed to Dr. De Buck, who had urgently invited the Bishop to attend the Vatican council, we have what might serve as a Ritualist Platform in 1869. And here we find, also, a program for the future course in contemplation. "We acknowledge that the condition of Anglicanism in reference to the great Church of the West is unsatisfactory, and that the prospects of the Church of England, politically, are not encouraging. Soon she will be emancipated alike from the trammels and the support of the State, and then most important changes are likely to occur. Reconciliation on fair terms with the Latin Church would, of course, be best absolutely for her. The Calvinistic element would incorporate itself with the Dissenters, or unite itself to the mass of political Churchmen, while it is to be hoped that God may open the way to the Catholic party, without injury to its convictions, resting under the Chair of St. Peter. It is to this consummation that present efforts must be directed. We may not live to see it; but surely to lay the foundation of such a work as this must be well pleasing to our Gracious Saviour." In his "Historical Notes," Oakley says:—"We endeavored, especially the younger and less occupied members of our Society, to improve our relations with foreign Catholics by occasional visits to the continent. For this purpose Belgium was preferred to France. Whatever our Tractarian friends may have been on this side of the channel, there could be no doubt of their perfect Catholicity on

the other. It was, in fact, of so enthusiastic and demonstrative a character as to astonish the natives themselves. . . . In the churches they were always in a state of prostration, or of ecstasy." In his Charge of Nov. 2, 1850, Bishop Blomfield of London said: "A propitiatory virtue is ascribed to the Eucharist—the mediation of the saints is spoken of as a probable doctrine—prayer for the dead urged as a positive duty—and a superstitious use of the sign of the Cross is recommended as profitable; add to this the secret practice of auricular confession, the use of crucifixes and rosaries, the administration of what is termed the sacrament of penance, and it is manifest that they who are taught to believe that such things are compatible with the principles of the English Church must also believe it to be separated from that of Rome by a faint and almost imperceptible line, and be prepared to pass that line without much fear of incurring the guilt of schism."

To educate the people toward Rome is also the purpose of those minor points of ritual, as vestments, positions, lights, mixing the wine on the altar, genuflexions and prostrations, and other usages not in themselves objectionable, but practiced by English Ritualists with a manner and measure of ostentation calculated to engage the attention of the worshipers and enlist their interest in what is by many looked upon as tokens of Catholicity. Thus Ritualism is, by friends and foes, looked upon as "the Preparatory School for the training of English Catholics," and the Roman Catholic *Ransomer* has said that "as to conversions it is well known that nine out of every dozen are the direct result of Ritualistic training."

If the question is asked, "What prompts the remaining three of the dozen to lapse into Romanism?" it may be answered by such events as the secession of Dr. De Costa subsequent to the reception of a heretic like Dr. Briggs into the Episcopal Church. It is the Broad church doctrine and practice at which many members of the Anglican Church

take offense. When, in 1880, Dean Church had presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury a Memorial claiming toleration in ritual, Pusey wrote on Jan. 14, 1881: "What the Dean of St. Paul asks for is simply that toleration which is accorded to every one else. The toleration granted to the Broad church is so large that it has publicly been said to be an anachronism when a clergyman parted from the Church of England because he disbelieved the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord." In 1870, Dean Stanley invited the members of the Committee for the Revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible to receive Holy Communion in Westminster Abbey, and a Unitarian member of the Committee was admitted to Communion with the rest. While this "Westminster Scandal," which was in no wise repudiated by the Bishops, was being agitated far and wide, efforts were set on foot to discontinue the use of the Athanasian Creed in the service of the Church, and among the promoters of this scheme the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Tait, was prominent. Pusey was foremost among the opponents of this measure, and the fight was hot, until, in May, 1873, the matter was finally adjusted by Convocation. The use of the Creed was retained, and a Synodical Declaration concerning the "condemnations" was adopted.

Having thus viewed the chief causes which secretly or openly worked or still work together for evil in the Romeward Movement in England during the nineteenth century, it remains for us also to point out some agencies whereby this current has been in a measure stemmed in its mighty course.

Among those who have in various ways endeavored to put the brakes on the wheels of Ritualism was the chief promoter of the Movement, Dr. Pusey. On Jan. 1, 1851, he wrote to Rev. W. Scott, of Christ Church, Hoxton: "I am grieved to hear of your trouble about your ritual. One most grievous offence seems to be turning your back to the people. I was not Ritualist enough to know, until the other

day, that the act of turning had any special meaning in the Consecration. . . . Dear Newman consecrated to the last of his consecrations at the North end of the altar. . . . I cannot myself think that this, or any other ritual, is of moment enough (if not essential to the Sacrament) that priests who would work in the service of the Church should give up, because the Bishop insists on his interpretation of the rubric." In a speech which he delivered when, on June 14, 1866, at the seventh anniversary meeting of the English Church Union he joined that society, Pusey said: "It is well known that I never was a Ritualist and that I never wrote a single word on ritual until a short time ago, when my opinion had been quoted against it." In the meeting of the same society, on Nov. 20, 1867, Pusey again spoke against ritual changes in opposition to the will of the congregations. "I do wish," he said, "to lay stress upon the point that no individual member of the whole body has a right to make changes by himself. . . . It has been said that we may have to wait a long time before we can introduce any change at all if we are to wait till we can win the parishioners. I believe it would be better to wait almost any time . . . rather than introduce changes against the will of the communicants."

But in this speech he had the great majority of his hearers against him, as the scraping of feet unmistakably indicated. Again, in a letter to Dr. Bright, of July 1873, Pusey wrote: "I have a thorough mistrust of the Ultra-Ritualist body. I committed myself some years ago to Ritualism, because it was unjustly persecuted, but I do fear that the Ritualists and the old Tractarians differ both in principle and in object. I hear there is a body, called 'the Society of the Faith,' or some such name, which desires that none except Ultra-Ritualists should belong to it." And to Dr. Liddon he wrote, Dec. 31, 1874: "The High Church have entrusted themselves to the extreme Ritualists, who are now their representatives, as the extreme party always is. . . . I was mistaken in them, and I have told Denison



that I cannot fight their battle." When it was known that some of the Ritualist clergymen endeavored to make private confession obligatory, and, in 1878, the question was addressed to Pusey, Liddon, and Canon Carter, Whether a clergyman of the Church of England had a right to *require* Confession before Communion, the three answers, given promptly and independently, clearly and unrestrictedly denied such right.

It was a grievous disappointment to the Ritualists when Pio Nono, in summoning the Vatican Council, issued invitations to the Eastern Bishops, and left the Anglican Bishops to consider themselves covered by a letter of the Pope issued Sept. 13, 1868, "Omnibus Protestantibus aliisque A Catholicis," not inviting them to attend the Council, but urging them to join the one fold. Pusey remarked: "We are lumped in under the general title of 'Protestants,'" and these were, by the "*aliisque*" put down as *A Catholici*. Anglican Orders were simply ignored, as was the Anglican Church. "We," said Pusey in a letter of March 24, 1869, "are satisfied about our Orders; we are exercising our priestly offices; we are satisfied that we are in the Catholic Church: we have nothing to gain. But we wish the broken intercommunion to be, if possible, healthfully restored."

In 1865 and the following years, Pusey entered into a controversy with Newman and wrote his three "*Eirenica*," in which he endeavored to set forth the points of agreement between the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Council of Trent. The third *Eirenicon* was published while the Vatican Council was being set into motion, and Pusey still hoped that the dogma of Papal Infallibility, which he discussed in this work, might be dealt with by the Council in a manner to leave a way open for the reunion of the Churches. It is worthy of note that in all the later editions of his third *Eirenicon* Pusey changed the title from "Is Healthful Reunion impossible?" to "Healthful Reunion, as conceived possible before the Vatican Council," and to Newman he wrote,

Aug. 26, 1870: "I have done what I could, and now have done with controversy and Eirenica." On July 2, 1880, Pusey wrote: "The majority of the Vatican Council crushed me. I have not touched any book of Roman controversy since. Pope Pius IX devised and carried two new articles of faith. . . . I could not, the other day, read some Encyclical of the present Pope because I did not know whether I was to read it as a third or a thirtieth general Epistle of St. Peter."

Pusey never expressed and probably never entertained a doubt as to the "Catholicity" of the Anglican Church, and looked upon secession to Rome as unnecessary and as inconsistent with true Churchmanship. On Oct. 9, 1839, he wrote to Rev. J. F. Russels: "In a word, it seems plainly a part of Christian charity to avoid all peculiarities which may be helped: all to whom the Catholicity of our Church has been brought home have a responsibility laid upon them; on them and their conduct it may depend how far this view of her (which is so calculated to win back those who are now in schism from her and to perfect her) shall be realized: or they may place obstacles to her reception of these very views. But without subdual of self we may be exposed to some grievous fall, from which we have hitherto been preserved, such as the going over of some to Romanism." In a letter of March 2, 1846, Pusey says:—"There are very serious things in the Roman Communion which ought to keep us where we are. I would instance chiefly the system as to the Blessed Virgin as the Mediatrix and Dispenser of all present blessings to mankind. (I think nothing short of a fresh Revelation could justify this.) Then the sale of Masses as applicable to the departed, the system of Indulgences as applied to the departed, the denial of the Cup to the laity." It is also remarkable that certain Ritualist endeavors to bring about a union with the Greeks and the Old Catholics after the Vatican Council found little favor with Pusey. There had been a time when he pondered the idea of union with the East. On Feb. 17, 1840, he wrote:

“What should hinder communion from being restored with the Orthodox Greek Church? Does it seem that we need insist on their receiving the *Filioque*, or that they would not enter into communion with us because we retain it?” But when at the later period mentioned above some of the advocates of union with the Greek Church used language which threatened to endanger the faith in the *Filioque* of the Creed, and he thought the Eastern Church Association was committing itself to this tendency, Pusey wrote to the Secretary of the society, “I think that we are doing mischief to our own people by accustoming them to the idea of abandoning the *Filioque*, and to the Russians by inflating them,” and he severed his connection with the Association. The Bonn Conferences in 1874 and 1875 held between representatives of the Anglican Church, the Old Catholics, and the Greek Church, displeased Pusey by the formula accepted in the latter year, because he held that the position of the Creed had been surrendered. “I do not,” he writes to Liddon, “see any occasion for any formula in which the Greeks and we should agree.” When, shortly after, the Eastern Church Association petitioned Convocation to consider the Bonn Resolution, he published a remonstrance, and when it was said that the Lambeth Conference of 1878 might remove the *Filioque*, he continued the fight.

Of other checks to the Romeward Movement we may mention that in February of that year, the Bishops, in the Convocation of Canterbury, had, in the Preamble of a resolution, denounced Ritualism, saying that it was in danger of favoring errors deliberately rejected by the Church of England. In the following year the Church Association, lately organized for the purpose of combating the Movement, opened its first active campaign against Ritualism. A Royal Commission on Ritual appointed in 1867 was also intended as a check to Ritualistic innovations.

In 1874, the old Court of Arches was, by the Public Worship Regulation Act, supplanted by a new court for

ecclesiastical cases, and a new Final Court of Appeal had been established for the same cases in the previous year. Ritualists were rigorously prosecuted. Tooth, a Vicar of Hatcham, was imprisoned for contempt of court when he refused to acknowledge the validity of the sentence imposed on him for ritualism. Since then, a number of cases were taken into the courts by the Church Association. But neither the Public Worship Regulation Act nor the methods and measures of the Church Association succeeded in rooting out or putting down Ritualism, but had the opposite effect of engaging public opinion in favor of the Movement, and, with all its eddies and whirlpools and a steady and powerful undercurrent the great mass of the High Church Party, if not the entire Anglican establishment, is being hurried onward in its Romeward course. A. G.

---



## Exegetical Theology.

---

### LEVITICUS XVIII.

The opening verses of this chapter mark a section of the Mosaic record of divine legislation for Israel, the chosen people of God. *And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am the Lord your God.*<sup>1)</sup> Jehovah, the Lawgiver, charges Moses, the mediator, the spokesman of God, to announce to the children of Israel the will of their God. The framers of human laws are careful to state the will of those in whom the legislative power is vested, and to state it in such terms as will enable those who are subject to the law, and those who are to administer the law in courts of justice, to know precisely what the law demands. And if clearness and distinctness is a property of holy Scripture generally, it should certainly be presumed where God publishes his will as the Legislator of his people. Or, in other words, if in the interpretation of language the terms employed by an author should be supposed to have a definite sense, unless the contrary be proven, then this supposition is all the more reasonable in the interpretation of law, and, by excellence, of divine law.

In the present instance, there was particular reason for clear and distinct legislative enactments on the subject with which the Lawgiver was about to deal. Israel had been for generations surrounded by a lewd and dissolute people, and was on the way to a country inhabited by lewd and lascivious nations. Hence the prohibition: *After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and*

---

1) Vv. 1 f.; cf. Lev. 1, 1 f.; 4, 1 f. 14; 6, 1. 8. 19. 24; 7, 22. 28; 8, 1; 11, 1 f.; 12, 1 f.; 13, 1; 14, 1; 15, 1; 16, 1 f.; 17, 1 f.; 19, 1 f.; 20, 1 f.; 21, 1; 22, 1 f.; 23, 1 f.; 24, 1 f.; 25, 1 f.; 27, 1 f.

after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do, neither shall ye walk in their ordinances;<sup>1)</sup> and the general admonition: Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein: I am the Lord your God. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them: I am the Lord.<sup>2)</sup> There is a peculiar solemnity about this preamble not found in like measure in any of the preceding or subsequent sections of Leviticus. The Lawgiver is evidently intent upon making this section particularly impressive, and for obvious reasons. By the evil examples indicated in verse 3 and their own propensities the Israelites were in particular danger of offending against the precepts promulgated in this chapter. Besides, the experience of all ages to the present time has shown that to regulate the sexual relations is a matter of extreme difficulty, that when men have set their hearts upon a certain union, they are apt to disregard or defy whatever would prevent the achievement of their purpose. Matrimonial and kindred causes are by far the most numerous class of *casus conscientiae*. And thus the Ruler of his people and the Governor of mankind appears concerned about the welfare of his subjects when he enacts statutes which are in form and substance subservient to the happiness of the governed, of individuals and human society, manifestations of the wisdom, the holiness, and the goodness, of God, of the Lord, before whom our own wisdom is foolishness, and our own will, if opposed to his, is rebellion the most heinous. The question in all cases coming under the law here about to be promulgated is not, What is expedient? or, What is customary? or, What is reasonable? or, What says this man or that man? but, What says the Lord? To do, also in these things, in reverent and willing obedience what the Lord would have us do, is to do what is good and right and truly expedient.

---

1) V. 3.

2) Vv. 4 f.

Here, too, it is true wisdom to *understand what the will of the Lord is,*<sup>1)</sup> and *proving what is acceptable to the Lord, we walk as children of light.*<sup>2)</sup>

Having, then, as in a preamble, disposed his people to willing and reverent obedience to his will, the Lord now proceeds to declare his will. The law which he is about to promulgate is a marriage law. The term גִּלּוּת עֶרְוָה, to *uncover nakedness*, is another euphemism for *carnal knowledge*. It is presumed that uncovering a woman's nakedness is but a preliminary act to be followed by sexual intercourse. But it is further understood that such intercourse is lawful in wedlock only.<sup>3)</sup> When, as in this and the subsequent verses, sexual commerce within certain degrees of kinship is prohibited, the scope of the law cannot be the prohibition of fornication, which is lawful in no degree: but it must be the prohibition of unlawful marriage. We do not find such divine legislation as: *Thou shalt not murder thy mother, for she is thy father's wife. Thou shalt not murder thy sister, for she was born of thy mother. Thou shalt not murder thy daughter, for she is thy flesh and blood. Thou shalt not murder thy wife, for thou hast promised to love her, etc.* Just as little may we understand the Lord to say: *Thou shalt not commit fornication with the flesh of thy flesh. That is to say, thou shalt not commit fornication with thy mother; she is thy mother. Thou shalt not commit fornication with thy sister, the daughter of thy father, or daughter of thy mother, whether she be born at home or born abroad; thou shalt not commit fornication with them. Thou shalt not commit fornication with thy son's daughter or with thy daughter's daughter; even fornication thou shalt not commit with them, etc.* The head line of the English Bible is correct when it says: *Unlawful marriages.*

In formulating this marriage law, the Lord first lays down the general prohibitory rule:

1) Eph. 5, 17.

2) Eph. 5, 10. 8. Cf. Rom. 13, 2.

3) Gen. 2, 24; 4, 1.

*None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness: I am the Lord.*

The original Hebrew is:

אִישׁ אִישׁ אֶל-כָּל-שָׂאֵר בָּשָׂרוֹ לֹא תִקְרְבוּ לְגִלּוֹת גֵּרֻהָ אֲנִי יְהוָה:

This is the authentic text, the letter, of the law. Every translation is, strictly speaking, not the letter of the law, but an interpretation of the law in the briefest terms. The translation is true when it conveys to its readers or hearers, who understand its language, precisely the same sense which was intended by the legislator in framing the original text. No interpretation or application of the translation is admissible which is incompatible with the original, and a translation which cannot convey the sense of the original must be discarded as a false interpretation. Thus, when the English text is to serve as a restatement of the law, the sense of the English words must be identical with that of the Hebrew words which constitute the letter of the law, and compliance with the law is conformity with the sense of those Hebrew words. If it were otherwise, the translators of the English Bible would be the lawgivers of the English people, and Luther would be the legislator of the Germans who use his version. Thus, to determine who those persons are, with whom a man, according to Lev. 18, 6, must not be joined in marriage, it is not final to show what, according to English usage, is the sense of the words, "*any that is near of kin to him*," or what, by German usage or etymology, is signified by "*seiner nächsten Blutsfreundin*." The question is what these words must signify according to the original Hebrew text, the sense of which they are to convey, the words, כָּל-שָׂאֵר בָּשָׂרוֹ. A closer literal translation of these words would be, all flesh of his flesh. This translation is still short of being fully adequate to the original. The Hebrew text has two different words for *flesh*, שָׂאֵר and בָּשָׂר. But as both words stand for all the significations of *flesh*, and we have no two English words covering all the meanings of *flesh*, *meat* standing only for flesh as food, our



word *flesh* answers for both שָׂר and בָּשָׂר. That these words jointly and severally signify kinship is out of question. The question can only be, what manner or degree of kinship, whether consanguinity, or affinity, or both, and if either or both, in what degree or degrees of either or both. As to שָׂר, it appears from the subsequent context that it denotes the consanguinity existing between a brother and his sister and a woman and her sister, the father's sister being termed his שָׂר,<sup>1)</sup> and the mother's sister, her שָׂר.<sup>2)</sup> Both are related in the first degree. Likewise, a woman's granddaughter is called her שָׂר.<sup>3)</sup> Thus, also, a man's mother, father, son, daughter, and sister, are subsumed under the term שָׂרוֹ, *his flesh*.<sup>4)</sup> In all these instances, שָׂר denotes the first degree of consanguinity. בָּשָׂר is similarly employed when Adam calls Eve בָּשָׂר כְּבָשָׂר, *flesh of my flesh*, inasmuch as they were related by a peculiar manner of consanguinity, the woman being *taken out of man*.<sup>5)</sup> But they were also related by affinity, as husband and wife, and of this relationship and that of all future husbands and wives, Adam says, הֵיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד, *they shall be unto one flesh*.<sup>6)</sup> This is quoted by Christ, ἔσονται οἱ σὺν εἰς σὰρκα μίαν,<sup>7)</sup> and St. Paul, accordingly, calls a man's wife קַדְשׁוֹ עַצְמוֹ שָׂר, *his own flesh*.<sup>8)</sup> Here, then, בָּשָׂר, σὰρξ, *flesh*, stands for the first degree of affinity. In other instances, בָּשָׂר denotes remoter degrees of consanguinity, as when Laban says to Jacob, his sister's son, בָּשָׂרִי אַתָּה, *thou art my flesh*,<sup>9)</sup> or when David calls all Israel, בָּשָׂרִי, *my flesh*<sup>10)</sup> in the same sense in which he calls them אֶחָיו, *my brethren*,<sup>11)</sup> when Isaiah says, *Hide not thyself from thine own flesh*,<sup>12)</sup> a man is supposed to look upon all his fellow-men as his בָּשָׂר, as coming from the same first parent. Together, the two words, as they appear in our

1) שָׂר אֶבְיָה הוּא, v. 12.

2) שָׂר אִמִּי הוּא, v. 13.

3) שָׂרָה, v. 17.

4) Lev. 21, 2. 3. Cf. Numb. 27, 11.

5) Gen. 2, 23.

6) Gen. 2, 24.

7) Matt. 19, 5.

8) Eph. 5, 29.

9) Gen. 29, 14.

10) 2 Sam. 19, 12.

11) Ibid.

12) Is. 58, 7.

text, שָׁאֵר בָּשָׂרוֹ, are elsewhere employed to denote near kinship in general, as in Lev. 25, 49 and Numb. 27, 11.

These being the various *usus loquendi* of the words שָׁאֵר and בָּשָׂר jointly and severally, the question arises, what these words, בָּל-שָׁאֵר בָּשָׂרוֹ, say in our text. Being undoubtedly words of a law, a divine statute, which is to serve as a rule for man's conduct, they must have a definite meaning, enabling those who are under the law to know when they keep within the limits of the law. To take בָּשָׂר in the widest sense, in which it seems to appear in Is. 58, 7, would make Lev. 18, 6 tantamount to a total prohibition of marriage, contrary to Gen. 2, 19—24. 1 Cor. 7, 2 ff. al. While the widest sense of the terms is, therefore, clearly inadmissible, the assumption of any narrower sense except the strictest would be an arbitrary supposition unwarranted by the text or its context, and every interpreter would be free to draw his own limits, instead of following out the limits of the law. This would run counter to the very nature of a law, and to the first principle of interpretation, that the true meaning of a word of a text can be but one.<sup>1)</sup> A law thus framed or interpreted could not serve as a norm of right and wrong either to the subjects of the law or to those who are to administer the law. When God says, *Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances, to walk therein: I am the Lord your God. Ye shall, therefore, keep my statutes, and my judgments;*<sup>2)</sup> and when he then proceeds to promulgate his statutes, he will certainly use such words and use them so that those who would walk in his statutes may not grope in the dark, but say with the psalmist: *Through thy precepts I get understanding. . . . Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path.*<sup>3)</sup>

Again, it is a principle of the interpretation of law that the purpose of a law is to guide us in its interpretation.<sup>4)</sup>

1) *Sensus literalis unus est.* 2) Vv. 4. 5. 3) Ps. 119, 104 f.

4) *Diligenter attendendum est ad scribentis scopum* is a general rule of Hermeneutics. Cf. Lieber, *Legal and Political Hermeneutics*, III ed., p. 159.

The purpose of this law is restrictive. The Egyptians and the Cananites and others were licentious, as the people before the flood had been, *taking them wives of all which they chose*.<sup>1)</sup> This was a violation of the will of God. For though the divine blessing pronounced upon the first couple, *Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth*,<sup>2)</sup> implied that it was the will of God that the sons and daughters of Adam and Eve should intermarry, and thus *of one blood all nations of men* should come,<sup>3)</sup> yet such intermarriage of near kinsmen was not to continue in order for all times. The intermarriage of the first brothers and sisters was within the plan of creation, which provided for one common ancestor of mankind and one mother of all living,<sup>4)</sup> and for the propagation of the race from this common stock, the marriage of brothers and sisters in the first generation was a necessary means to the end. Such marriage and sexual intercourse is, therefore, not absolutely a violation of the creative order and the law of nature, and to dispose such marriages was not simply incompatible with the holiness of God, who might have avoided their necessity by creating two human couples, whose children might have intermarried to replenish the earth. But it was not the will of God, not within the creative order and the law of nature, that brothers should marry their sisters after such intermarriage had ceased to be a matter of necessity. Long before the promulgation of the written law, Abraham and the Egyptians and the Cananites knew that it was an abomination to marry one's own sister. For Abraham correctly presumed that the Egyptians and their king as well as Abimelech the Cananite would hold that if Sarah was Abraham's sister she could not be his wife.<sup>5)</sup> We read of no positive legislation or special revelation whereby they knew such marriage to be prohibited. The natural law inscribed in their hearts sufficed to teach them that what had been permitted to Cain was not lawful

---

1) V. 3. Cf. Gen. 6, 2.

4) Gen. 3, 20.

2) Gen. 1, 28.

5) Gen. 12, 11—19; 20, 2—12.

3) Acts 17, 26.

in Abraham. But the time had come when the Egyptians and the Cananites had set aside this natural law and married regardless of consanguinity and affinity, though the law was still in force and binding upon them, and, as we shall see later on in this chapter, the nations not under the special law of Israel were looked upon by God as defiled by such abominations, and the iniquity thereof was to be visited upon them.<sup>1)</sup> Now, lest Israel, too, should be misled into such ignorance and sinful practices and incur the righteous wrath of God, the Lord republishes his holy will by promulgating these restrictive statutes, the written law of prohibited degrees. And the words which mark the sacred limits between prohibited and lawful marriage are, כָּל-שֹׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ, *all flesh of his flesh*. To assume for these words a vague and undefined meaning would be to frustrate the very end and purpose of the law, which is to define who may and who may not intermarry. In Lev. 25, 49 and Numb. 27, 11 we have *enlarging* statutes,<sup>2)</sup> the nature of which is to extend the limits of the law, and the terms, שֹׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ, are there used, accordingly, in a wider sense compatible with the scope of the law. Here, in a restrictive statute, the terms, to answer their purpose, must be taken in a stricter sense, the sense in which they determine within its narrowest limits what is here to be determined, the limits without and up to which marriage shall be lawful, but within which, as within a sacred circle, men must not penetrate in intermarriage. Hence the terms שֹׁאֵר and בְּשָׂר must, in our text, signify either nothing at all to the purpose, or the nearest kinship, the first degree of consanguinity or affinity, any person who, either by direct or common propagation, or by marriage, is one's flesh, one's father or mother, son or daughter, brother or sister, husband or wife. And the limit determined by the rule is that of כָּל-שֹׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ, *all flesh of one's flesh*, the nearest kin to one's nearest kin, as, the

---

1) Lev. 18, 24 f.

2) Vid. Blackstone, Commentaries, I, 87.



father's daughter, the mother's daughter, a son's wife, a wife's mother, the father's sister, the mother's sister, a brother's wife, a wife's daughter, a wife's sister. All degrees within this limit are prohibited, be they שָׂאֵר, or בָּשָׂר, or שָׂאֵר בָּשָׂר. What is beyond this limit, as far as this rule is concerned, is free. A man may not marry his sister or his natural mother or daughter; for they are his flesh. He may not marry his brother's or sister's daughter, for they are the flesh of his flesh. But he may marry the daughter of his father's brother or of his mother's sister; for they are the flesh of the flesh of his flesh, שָׂאֵר בָּשָׂר בָּשָׂר.

It should, furthermore, be noted that the law says, בָּשָׂר שָׂאֵר בָּשָׂר, *ALL flesh of his flesh*. It is immaterial whether the kinship have arisen in wedlock or out of wedlock. A man's illegitimate sister is as truly *his flesh* as a sister born in wedlock. A son's concubine is as truly that son's flesh as his wife is, since *he which is joined to an harlot is one body; for two, saith he, shall be one flesh*,<sup>1)</sup> and a father who would marry his son's concubine would approach *the flesh of his flesh*. The degrees are the same, whether by whole or half blood. Thus, a man's sister is his flesh, whether they come from the same mother or from different mothers, if they have the same father, or from different fathers, if they have the same mother, and the man who marries a half brother's daughter or a half sister's daughter approaches *the flesh of his flesh*. But a wife's son by a former marriage may marry her husband's daughter by a former marriage; for she is the flesh of the flesh of his flesh, his father's wife's daughter.

The Hebrew wording of the rule, Lev. 18, 6, decides still another point. We hold that valid betrothal, the expressed mutual consent of marriageable parties to be husband and wife, constitutes the essence of marriage, according to the maxim that *consensus, non concubitus facit*

1) 1 Cor. 6, 16.

*matrimonium*. Parents call their son's betrothed bride their daughter before the consummation of the marriage. Yet this relationship does not constitute or create a prohibited degree under the law; for by betrothal the two are not made *one flesh*, as by sexual intercourse; the one is not yet the other's אִשָּׁה or בִּשְׁמִי, and a man is not barred from marrying his deceased brother's betrothed bride, who, having not yet become one flesh with his brother, is not the *flesh of his flesh*. For the same reason a deceased bride's sister is not within the prohibition, but may be taken in marriage according to the letter and spirit of the law. On the other hand, according to the terms of the law, affinity being an impediment not because of the *vinculum matrimoniale*, but because of sexual coition, the impediment by affinity remains in force, though the *vinculum* have been dissolved by death or divorce. For such dissolution does not undo the fact that carnal knowledge has taken place between the parties so related. Hence, to marry one's own father's or brother's or son's widow is still approaching to *the flesh of one's flesh*, and, therefore, prohibited under the general statute.

In view of all these applications of the rule it appears that, while, with the assumption of any but the strict signification of the terms, Lev. 18, 6 would be of no use at all as a restrictive statute and, in fact, of no real use in any sense, the rule properly understood is a perfect masterpiece of legislation, so simple in its application that every man and woman of average intelligence can, by this rule, determine in every given case, whether a marriage is lawful or prohibited by the statute, and so sure in its operation that all the cases are covered, a veritable lamp unto our feet and light unto our path. Thus, and thus only, we have here a statute which sheds forth the glory of the wisdom and goodness of Him who has affixed his signature thereto, אֲנִי יְהוָה, I JEHOVAH. By this solemn mark of authority the Lord would say, Let every man heed what I here enjoin,

and beware of trespassing beyond the limit I have here defined!

We are aware that there are those who hold different views concerning the import of the text, v. 6. They may be divided into two classes. Some would have שאר בשרו to denote only relatives in the first degree, as parents, children, brothers, sisters, or even restrict the meaning of the term to the kinship between parent and child. They look upon verse 6 as the first of a series of special statutes, the prohibition of a man's marriage with his daughter. But they cannot point to a single instance where שאר בשרו is used in this sense. And if they could, they would still fail to make their point, which is the refusal to accept certain arguments based upon the computation of degrees. For there is no prohibited degree which is not represented in kind by some one or several of the special statutes following what we consider the general rule. Others maintain that שאר בשרו as well as שאר must be taken for *relatives* generally, and look upon verse 6 as something akin to a caption in a statute book, stating in a broad way the subject matter of the ensuing paragraphs. But verse 6 is more than a caption; it is a statute in form and substance, a prohibitory, restrictive statute, if it is anything at all. That שאר בשרו anywhere else in the Hebrew Bible stands simply for שאר is an assertion which has not been and cannot be proved.<sup>1)</sup> And if it could, an *usus loquendi* according to which *the flesh of his flesh* might signify relationship of every degree, however near or remote, would be inadmissible *here*. It is excluded by the word כָּל, which demands that שאר בשרו should be taken in its *whole* compass. Hence this compass *must* be *definite*. And this compass cannot extend to all relatives. That there are some relatives, also by consanguinity, such as first and second cousins, with whom mar-

1) In Lev. 20, 19 the pronoun *his* may refer and probably refers to *father*, the masculine noun next preceding the word having the personal suffix י. Cf. Lev. 18, 12, 13.

riage is not prohibited, is conceded on all sides. Hence, when God says: "Every man shall, in marriage, abstain from ALL *flesh of his flesh*," the words *flesh of his flesh* must be used in a sense which does *not* comprise first and second cousins and other relatives avowedly unprohibited.

What has been said concerning the general statute, v. 6, is in all its parts and details borne out by the subsequent context. Here we have a series of special statutes, by which the general rule is applied and exemplified. This series extends from v. 7 to v. 17 of the chapter. All these special statutes are, as the general statute, prohibitions of intermarriage within certain degrees of carnal relationship. The series comprises degrees of consanguinity and degrees of affinity enumerated promiscuously, the cases mentioned in vv. 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 17 being of the former, and those in vv. 8, 14, 15, and 16, of the latter class. In every instance but one we have a relationship that comes within the compass of the general statute, carnal kinships included in the limit of שָׂאֵר בְּשָׂרִי, kinships of the first or the second degree of consanguinity or affinity. All these cases but the exceptional one are distinctly referred to the general statute, inasmuch as in each case the reason given for the prohibition is a proximity of kinship encompassed within the terms of the general statute. And this is all the more apparent, since in the only instance which exceeds that limit the same reason is not given, but another.

The relationships mentioned as precluding intermarriage are those of a man and his mother,<sup>1)</sup> his stepmother,<sup>2)</sup> his sister or half sister,<sup>3)</sup> his son's daughter,<sup>4)</sup> his daughter's daughter,<sup>5)</sup> his stepmother's daughter,<sup>6)</sup> his father's sister,<sup>7)</sup> his mother's sister,<sup>8)</sup> his uncle's wife,<sup>9)</sup> his daughter-in-law,<sup>10)</sup> his brother's wife,<sup>11)</sup> his wife's daughter or granddaughter.<sup>12)</sup>

1) v. 7.

2) v. 8.

3) v. 9.

4) v. 10.

5) v. 10.

6) v. 11.

7) v. 12.

8) v. 13.

9) v. 14.

10) v. 15.

11) v. 16.

12) v. 17.



Other kinships, also covered by the general rule, but not mentioned in the special statutes, are those of a man and his daughter, his mother-in-law, his brother's daughter, his sister's daughter, and his deceased wife's sister, all of whom are within the limit of *the flesh of his flesh*, and are, therefore, excluded from marriage with him by the general statute and by special statutes covering like degrees and stating a ground of prohibition applicable to both. That the specification was not intended to be exhaustive, and that the omission of a case is not a license, appears also from the fact that of marriage with one's mother-in-law, which is not specified in Leviticus, we read in Deuteronomy, *Cursed be he that lieth with his mother in law. And all the people shall say, Amen.*<sup>1)</sup>

What we have gathered from a survey of the series will further appear as we examine the special statutes seriatim.

In verse 7 we have a prohibition of marriage with one's natural mother: *The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother shalt thou not uncover: she is thy mother; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.* It has already been pointed out that *to uncover nakedness* in these statutes cannot primarily mean *to commit fornication*, there being no reason why God should, in prohibiting this sin, take such special care to define the various kinships within which a sin should be avoided which is simply unlawful everywhere. For a similar reason the scope of this verse, as also of verses 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17, cannot be to prohibit adultery or adulterous marriages as such, the union with a person who has a husband living, as this sin is specially prohibited in verse 20: *thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbor's wife*, and is a heinous sin everywhere and under all circumstances, kinship or no kinship. What the statute would prohibit is incestuous or quasi incestuous marriage, marriage in a prohibited degree of kinship. A man, according

---

1) Deut. 27, 23.

to v. 7, must not marry his natural mother, also where no adultery would be committed, i. e., after his father's death. By such marriage and the consummation thereof in carnal coition he would uncover not only his mother's, but also his father's nakedness. Hence it is clear that under the divine law the kinship created by affinity is in force also after the death of the one party.

The same appears from the 8 verse: *The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover: it is thy father's nakedness.* Here a man is prohibited from marrying his stepmother, who is not his natural mother, but his father's wife by later marriage. The reason assigned in the statute is, again, not that such marriage would be adulterous, but that it would be incestuous, in a prohibited degree of affinity, שָׂאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ, the stepmother's nakedness being also the father's nakedness, as the two are one flesh and the father's wife or widow is to his son the *flesh of his flesh*. That the prohibition refers also to the deceased father's wife, further appears from Lev. 20, 11: *The man that lieth with his father's wife hath uncovered his father's nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to death.* For this statute is immediately preceded by another, saying: *The man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death.* This statute would fully cover, penalty and all, the subsequent statute if the latter only referred to adultery with the living father's wife, and not to incest with the father's widow. This is the form of incest of which St. Paul speaks 1 Cor. 5, 1—5, describing it, not as πορνεία, *adultery*, but πορνεία, *fornication, illicit carnal commerce, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles.*<sup>1)</sup> Of such incestuous connections the Roman Lawyer Severus says: *Si quis viduam . . . cognatam, cum qua nuptias contra-*

1) 1 Cor. 5, 1.

*here non potest, corruperit, in insulam deportandus est;*<sup>1)</sup> i. e., "If any man has defiled a widow akin to him, with whom he cannot contract marriage, he shall be deported to an island."

The following verses refer to degrees of consanguinity.

V. 9. *The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father, or daughter of thy mother, whether she be born at home or born abroad, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover.* The sister here mentioned is the half-sister born in the common parent's former wedlock, either at home, in the common father's family, by his deceased wife, or abroad, in a different, viz. the common mother's family, by her former husband. The sister is, in either case, an elder sister, yet her brother's שׂאיר, and hence akin to him in a prohibited degree.

In verse 10, marriage with one's grandchildren is prohibited: *The nakedness of thy son's daughter, or of thy daughter's daughter, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover; for theirs is thine own nakedness.* The difference between this relationship and the preceding one is that the former was in collateral lines, while the present one is in the direct line. Thus we see that both lines of consanguinity are covered by the law. And there is no difference, whether the grandchild be the son's daughter or the daughter's daughter; the degree being the same, the effect is the same. The grandchild's nakedness is said to be the grandfather's nakedness; for the one is the other's flesh. But in v. 16, the wife's nakedness is said to be her husband's nakedness; for they, too, are one flesh. This shows that the effects of consanguinity and of affinity are the same under the law of prohibited degrees.

The 11 verse says: *The nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father, she is thy sister, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.* This case differs

---

1) Instit. L. II.

somewhat from that mentioned in v. 9. There it was an elder sister, here it is a younger sister, with whom marriage is prohibited, a daughter whom the man's stepmother bore to his father. The degree being in both cases the same, the effect is again the same. Brother and sister, though variously conceived, are each other's flesh and must not intermarry.

That a sister is her brother's *flesh* is expressly said in verse 12: *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister: she is thy father's near kinswoman*, or, his אִשָּׁתוֹ, *his flesh*. But being the father's *flesh*, she is to the son the *flesh of his flesh* and therefore prohibited to him in marriage because of this near kinship by consanguinity.

The same degree, though of a different genesis, is specified in verse 13: *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister: for she is thy mother's near kinswoman*. Here again the near kinship, that the mother's sister is her אִשָּׁתָּהּ, *her flesh*, and hence to that mother's son the *flesh of his flesh*, is given as the reason why a man should not marry his mother's sister, even as he should not marry his father's sister, and for the same reason. In this instance, and also in the preceding case, another reason might have been given. The father's sister as well as the mother's sister is an aunt, and thus a superior relative, whom the nephew should, accordingly, respect. But in neither case does the Lawgiver say, *For she is thine aunt*. In both instances, v. 12 and v. 13, the prohibition of intermarriage is based upon the sameness of *flesh*, whereby the case comes under the general statute, *None of you shall approach to the flesh of his flesh, to uncover their nakedness*.

But there was an *aunt* who did not come under this rule, and whom, for another reason, the Lawgiver deemed it proper to mention in this connection as prohibited from marriage with her nephew. The Lord proceeds, verse 14: *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother; thou shalt not approach to his wife: SHE IS THINE AUNT*.



Here we have a degree of affinity which is not covered by the general statute, v. 6. The wife of one's father's brother is not the nephew's *שָׁאֵר בָּשָׂר*, but the *flesh of the flesh of his flesh*, one degree beyond the kinship defined in the general rule and exemplified in the preceding special statutes. Hence the Lawgiver does not here base the prohibition on the degree of kinship, but gives a different reason, saying, *For she is thine aunt*, a person who, because of her relationship with thy father, should rank above thee, while, as thy wife, she would be subordinate to thee, her head and lord. Hence, though in this case the degree of kinship would be no bar to the marriage, the conflict between the respect due to the father and aunt on the one hand and the respect due to the husband on the other hand should be avoided, and a marriage involving such conflict is for this reason prohibited. It is, of course, the *deceased* uncle's wife who is here denied to the nephew; for to marry a living uncle's wife would be adultery and for *this* reason prohibited. On the other hand, the marriage of a niece with her deceased aunt's husband is not prohibited for any reason, neither for the degree of kinship, which is beyond the prohibited degrees, nor for the *respectus parentelae*, which is not in conflict but agrees with the respect she owes her uncle. But the niece in the nearer degree, the brother's or sister's daughter, is prohibited, being to the uncle the *flesh of his flesh*, related in the same degree as the father's or mother's sister prohibited in vv. 12 and 13.

Having thus disposed of the exceptional case where it was suggested by the context, the Lord proceeds, verse 15: *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter in law: she is thy son's wife; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness*. As fornication and adultery is prohibited in every case and form, and, hence, no special prohibitions are annexed to the general prohibition of adultery, verse 20, the present special statute, which also deals with a degree of affinity, presumes the death of the son whose wife is here

denied to the father-in-law, being the *flesh of his flesh*, the *flesh*, by marriage, of him who is his *flesh* by direct propagation.

The statute of verse 15 refers to a case in which one of the connections was by lineal consanguinity and the other by affinity. The following statute describes a case where one of the connections is by collateral consanguinity and the other, again, by affinity, verse 16: *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness*. For the reasons stated above, the death of the brother is here assumed, and the marriage prohibited is with a deceased brother's wife, who is to her brother-in-law the *flesh of his flesh*. That marriage produces oneness of flesh is here expressly stated as the reason why marriage is in this case prohibited; the wife's nakedness is her husband's nakedness; they are one flesh.<sup>1)</sup> This decides also the parallel case, that of marriage with the deceased wife's sister. According to verse 13, a woman's sister is her *flesh*. Both the brother's wife and the wife's sister are sisters-in-law; the kinships are equidistant, made up, in each case, by two connections, one by collateral consanguinity and one by affinity. And as in the one case, marriage with the sister-in-law is prohibited expressly because of the existing kinship, marriage with the sister-in-law in the other case, the kinship being equidistant and made up of the same elements, is also prohibited. In like manner the prohibition of marriage with the daughter-in-law, v. 15, implies also the prohibition of marriage with the mother-in-law, the two kinships being likewise equidistant and made up of the same elements of consanguinity and affinity. To deny that the marriage with the deceased wife's sister is prohibited, because that prohibition is not expressly mentioned in a special statute, though covered by the general

---

1) Cf. v. 8 where the nakedness of the father's wife is said to be the father's nakedness.

statute and the special statute in verse 16, is as groundless as the denial of the prohibition of marriage with the deceased wife's mother would be on the plea that such marriage is not expressly prohibited by special statute in Leviticus. Now we know that the latter marriage, which is also covered by the general statute and the special statute concerning the daughter-in-law, v. 15, is a damnable abomination, from what we read in Deut. 27, 23. This conclusively shows that a marriage is not admissible because it is not specially prohibited in Lev. 18, where the prohibited degrees are enumerated. Where in Lev. 18, or where from Genesis to Revelation, is a father's marriage with his daughter expressly and by special statute proscribed? We know that such marriage is forbidden, because it comes within the compass of the general rule, v. 6, and the same degrees are covered by special statutes, as vv. 7 and 10, stating the nearness of kinship as the reason of the prohibition. And in like manner we know that marriage with the deceased wife's sister is prohibited, because such marriage comes under the general prohibitory statute, v. 6, and is covered by special statute, referring to the same degrees and elements of kinship, v. 16, and also giving this nearness of kinship as the reason for the prohibition.

All this is in accordance with the rules governing the interpretation, construction, and application of laws everywhere. In England, wherever the word "king" occurs in a law, it is understood that the word "queen" is to be assumed when the monarch is a woman, and the term "queen's bench" at once takes the place of the term "king's bench" as soon as a female succeeds a male royal ruler of the realm. The statute of the Roman Twelve Tables, *Si pater filium ter venum duit filius a patre liber esto*,<sup>1)</sup> certainly included daughters and grandchildren, though they were not expressly named, according to the legal maxim, *Filii appel-*

1) "If a father sell his son thrice, the son shall be free from the father."

*latione omnes liberos intelligimus*, and when Roman jurists restricted the effect of the statute to the sons, they knew that they were not interpreting the law according to its genuine sense, but taking advantage of the letter of an unpopular law to weaken its effect by declaring daughters and grandchildren emancipated after a single sale. They did very much as many theologians, and others who are not theologians, do in the interpretation or application of Lev. 18, who also take undue advantage of what they consider the letter of the law. An example of marriage legislation also comprising an enumeration of prohibited connections which was not intended to be exhaustive we have in the Institutions of Justinian, Tit. X, *De Nuptiis*. Here we read: § 11. *Sunt et aliae personae, quae propter diversas rationes nuptias contrahere prohibentur*, i. e., "There are still other persons who are, for various reasons, prohibited from contracting marriage." As an instructive point of coincidence we mention that Justinian too, treating of degrees of affinity, speaks of the "stepdaughter," the "daughter-in-law," the "step-mother," and the "mother-in-law," where the *vinculum matrimoniale* by which that kinship was superinduced no longer exists but the effect of the kinship as a bar to inter-marriage remains. He says: § 6. *Adfinitatis quoque ratione quarundam nuptiis abstinere necesse est: ut ecce privignam aut nurum uxorem ducere non licet, quia utraeque filiae loco sunt*; i. e., "By reason of affinity, too, marriage with certain women must be abstained from. Thus, it is not permitted to take in marriage the stepdaughter or the daughter-in-law, because both hold the place of daughters." This is the law: a man must not marry his stepdaughter or his daughter-in-law, because of their near kinship by affinity. And where this reason is given, the bond of wedlock which brought about the kinship by affinity is, also according to Justinian, supposed to be dissolved, either by death or divorce. This appears from the explanatory words which follow; viz.: *Quod ita scilicet accipi debet, si fuit*

III, P. 414 ff.



*nurus aut privigna tua. Nam si adhuc nurus est, id est, si adhuc nupta est filio tuo, alia ratione uxorem eam ducere non possis, quia ea duobus nupta esse non potest. Item si adhuc privigna tua est, id est si mater ejus tibi nupta est, ideo eam uxorem ducere non poteris, quia duas uxores eodem tempore habere non licet; i. e., "which must be understood thus: if she has been your daughter-in-law or stepdaughter. For if she is still your daughter-in-law, that is, if she is still married to your son, you cannot take her in marriage for another reason, because she cannot be married to two men. Likewise, if she is still your stepdaughter, that is, if her mother is married to you, you cannot take her for a wife because you are not allowed to have two wives at the same time."* Then follows the next paragraph of the law with a similar explanation: § 7. *Socrum quoque et novercam uxorem ducere prohibitum est, quia matris loco sunt. Quod et ipsum dissoluta demum adfinitate procedit. Alioquin, si adhuc noverca est, id est, si adhuc patri tuo nupta est, communi jure impeditur tibi nubere, quia eadem duobus nupta esse non potest. Item si adhuc socrus est, id est, si adhuc filia ejus tibi nupta est, ideo impediuntur nuptiae, quia duas uxores habere non possis; i. e., "To take in marriage a mother-in-law or a stepmother is also prohibited, because they hold the place of a mother. And this, too, obtains when the affinity has been dissolved. Otherwise, when she is still your stepmother, that is, when she is still married to your father, she is by common law prevented from marrying you, because she cannot be married to two men. Likewise, if she is yet your mother-in-law, that is, if her daughter is still married to you, the marriage is hindered by this reason, that you cannot have two wives."* Here, again, the Emperor calls attention to the fact that when affinity and the kinship accruing therefrom is considered as the reason for the prohibition of marriage in certain cases, the supposition is always that the marriage itself by which the affinity and kinship was super-

induced no longer exists, that the *vinculum* has been, by death or otherwise, dissolved, while the effect still operates as a bar to the parties so related. Otherwise, the previous marriage still existing, the offense committed by the illicit marriage under consideration would come under the common head of adultery, which is a sin and crime anyway, kinship or no kinship. Indeed, the clamor for proof that in Lev. 18, 16 the *deceased* brother's wife is meant, or the bold assertion that it is the *living* brother's wife, is an absurdity which, but for its evil tendency and dangerous consequences, would be hardly worthy of serious consideration.

After this digression we return to the exposition of our chapter. The series of special prohibitory statutes is continued, verse 17: *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter, neither shalt thou take her son's daughter, or her daughter's daughter, to uncover her nakedness; for they are her near kinswomen; it is wickedness.* Here as before the purpose of the lawgiver cannot be to proscribe polygamy or adultery. For in this case there would be no sense in describing a particular kinship and pointing out the sameness of flesh, as this statute does. The statute, by the words *שְׁאֵרָה הִנָּה they are her flesh*, brings the case under the general rule and states the reason for the prohibition, the kinship existing between a man and the daughter or granddaughter of his wife, the *flesh of his flesh*. Hence the marriage here prohibited is not the contemporaneous polygamous marriage of a man with a woman and her daughter or granddaughter, but the consecutive marriage of a man with the daughter or granddaughter of his deceased wife. This union is termed *זִנָּה*, a lewd *design*, because of its eminently repugnant character, and, perhaps, to mark the end of the series of special statutes under the general rule laid down and placed at the head of them in verse 6. For with verse 17 the line of special prohibitions begun in verse 7, in which certain degrees of kinship are described and such kinship is pointed out as the reason for the pro-

hibition of marriage, is brought to a close, and the epithet added to the last in the series may be fitly referred to all the rest, they being all essentially of the same kind, though not all of the same gravity. This is clear from the difference in the penalties imposed by the Lawgiver. For the offenders against verses 7, 8, 9, 15, 17 the penalty was death, according to Lev. 20, 11. 12. 14. 17. Of the offenders against verses 12, 13, 14, 16, the Lord says, they shall bear their iniquity, they shall die childless, Lev. 20, 19—21. Such marriages, when once contracted and consummated, were not to be dissolved.

These, then, are the degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which consecutive marriages are prohibited according to Lev. 18, 6—17. The subsequent statute, v. 18, is this: *Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life time.* This prohibition does not speak of marriage with the deceased wife's sister, either expressly or by implication; but, as is clear from the words, *beside the other in her life time*, a man is here prohibited from being the husband of two women at the same time. Whether the two women be two sisters as the word is commonly understood among us, or אִשָּׁה אֶל-אֲחֹתָהּ, *a woman to her sister*, stands for *a woman to another woman*, may be a matter of dispute. The constant usage of the phrase אִשָּׁה אֶל-אֲחֹתָהּ or the corresponding masculine form, אִישׁ אֶל-אָחִיו, appears from the following quotations:—Gen. 13, 11: *And they separated themselves, THE ONE FROM THE OTHER.* Exod. 16, 15: *And when the children of Israel saw it, they said ONE TO THE OTHER—.* Exod. 26, 5: *That the loops may take hold ONE OF THE OTHER.* Exod. 26, 6:—*and couple the curtains TOGETHER with the taches.* Exod. 26, 17: *Two tenons shall there be in one board, set in order ONE AGAINST ANOTHER.* Exod. 37,—*with their faces ONE TO ANOTHER.* Numb. 14, 4: *And they said ONE TO ANOTHER, Let us make a captain.* Jer. 23, 35: *Thus shall ye say every one to his neighbor, and EVERY ONE*

TO HIS BROTHER. Jer. 25, 26: *And all the kings of the north, far and near, ONE WITH ANOTHER*—. Ezek. 1, 9: *Their wings were joined ONE TO ANOTHER*. Ezek. 1, 23: *And under the firmament were their wings straight, THE ONE TOWARD THE OTHER*. Ezek. 3, 13: *I heard also the noise of the wings of the living creatures that TOUCHED ONE ANOTHER*. Joel 2, 8: *Neither shall ONE trust ANOTHER; they shall walk every one in his path*. In all these instances, the words we have given in capitals stand for the Hebrew *אִשָּׁה אֶל-אָחִיהָ* or *אִישׁ אֶל-אָחָיו*, a woman to her sister, or a man to his brother. According to this uniform *usus loquendi*, the meaning of our text, Lev. 18, 18, would be: *Neither shalt thou take one woman to another*, etc. This interpretation, according to which the import of verse 18 is simply a prohibition of polygamy, has in its favor the constant and uniform *usus loquendi* of the Hebrew scriptures, from Genesis to Malachi, and the interpreter should ask for good and sufficient reason why the present text should be looked upon as the only exception from this general usage before rejecting what would be the sense of the text according to such usage. The statement that the phrase in question means "one to another" only when preceded by a plural noun is not tenable in view of Numb. 16, 4. Jer. 23, 35 and Mal. 2, 10. The objection that the text cannot be a prohibition of polygamy because polygamy was permitted by the Mosaic law is an argument involving a *petitio principii*; for the chapter and verse of the Mosaic law where polygamy is licensed can not be shown. That polygamy was practiced by David and Solomon and others, while monogamous marriage was certainly the rule in Israel, is no more conclusive proof of polygamy being permitted by the law, than the open and extensive sale of intoxicants on Sunday in a city like St. Louis, where such traffic is prohibited by the existing Sunday law, is proof that such law cannot mean what it says, but requires an interpretation according to which it would not say what it says, and say what it does not say.



That the ancient versions agree with the rendering of the English Bible is not a decisive argument for the correctness of such rendering; for the ancient versions are no more authoritative than the English version is, while the Hebrew Bible is authoritative for the interpretation of a Hebrew text, and the meaning of Hebrew words and phrases must be determined by the Hebrew Bible, not by a Greek, Latin, or English version, or by all three combined. There is but one objection which is of weight and seems to speak in favor of the English wording of the text. It is this, that in all the preceding context the Hebrew words for *woman*, or *wife*, and *sister*, are employed as these words are taken in the English version of verse 18. This argument loses some of its weight when we consider that with verse 18 a new series of statutes begins, and therefore the bearing of the previous context upon this verse is not what it would otherwise be. The reason for the prohibition of the union described in verse 18, as given in this verse, is not that given in the previous verses, the near kinship existing between the two wives, and the marriage here prohibited is not consecutive, as in the previous cases, but contemporaneous, as appears from the words, *beside the other in her life time*. And if, as we have shown above, the prohibition of the *deceased* wife's sister is implied in the prohibition of marriage with the deceased brother's wife, the degrees being equidistant and composed of corresponding elements, the prohibition of marriage with the *living* wife's sister is certainly not a continuation of a series of homogeneous prohibitory statutes, but, whatever its import may be, certainly introduces a new species of prohibitions, such as the prohibition of polygamy would be. There is but one consideration which would account for a special statute covering the contemporaneous marriage of a man with two sisters in the Mosaic law as particularly intended for the people of Israel. It is the consideration of the fact that this people was sprung from just such a union, that of Jacob with the two sisters Leah and

Rachel, and the supposition that the descendants of an ancestor so married might be inclined to repeat what their great ancestor had done, to take two sisters in marriage. This might account for a special prohibition of a form of polygamy for which the history of this people might appear to afford a special inducement or excuse. But be this as it may; one thing is certain, that verse 18 has nothing to say concerning the legality or illegality of marriage with the *deceased* wife's sister. This marriage is prohibited by the general rule, verse 6, and by the special statutes covering the same degree, and if for some particular reason marriage with the living wife's sister is particularly prohibited, this prohibition does not as a matter of course nullify the previous prohibition of marriage with the deceased wife's sister. In the state of Missouri there was a particular reason for a statute that said: "All persons of color living or cohabiting together as husband and wife, without being married according to the provisions of this chapter, shall be liable to a criminal prosecution." This statute, which was made a part of the marriage law of the State in 1865, as section 16 of the chapter on *Marriage and Marriage contracts*, never implied that persons *not* "of color" might cohabit together as husband and wife, without being married according to law, even though no prohibition of such cohabitation of white persons was embodied in the chapter on Marriage. It is remarkable that we find no special penalty imposed on the marriage prohibited in verse 18. But this, again, does not indicate that a man might at his pleasure regard or disregard this law, which is a reassertion of a dictate of the natural law.

In verse 19 we read: *Also thou shalt not approach unto a woman to uncover her nakedness, as long as she is put apart for her uncleanness.*

Verse 20 is a statute against adultery: *Moreover thou shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbor's wife, to defile thyself with her.*

Verse 21 prohibits a species of spiritual adultery: *And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord.*

And two more species of sexual uncleanness are prohibited in the subsequent verses: Verse 22: *Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind: it is abomination.* Verse 23: *Neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it is confusion.*

These are the statutes of the section or sections marked by the opening verses of this chapter. And as they were preceded by a general admonition, so they are closely followed by a general admonition and warning. Verses 24—30: *Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you. And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations; neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you:—(for all these abominations have the men of the land done which were before you, and the land is defiled;) that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you. For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people. Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, that ye commit not any one of these abominable customs, which were committed before you, and that ye defile not yourselves therein: I am the Lord your God.*

From the repeated reference to the Gentile nations who had practiced and still practiced the abominations mentioned and prohibited in the preceding statutes, and from the reference to the divine punishment imposed and inflicted upon such Gentiles for such abominations committed

by them, whereby they had defiled themselves and the land they inhabited, it is clear that the abominations thus censured and punished were, in the sight of God, offenses against a law not binding upon the people of Israel only, but sins against the moral law binding upon Israel and the Gentiles alike, a law which was in force before the laws of Moses were enacted and promulgated. And hence it furthermore appears that the statutes contained in Leviticus XVIII, also the laws concerning marriage within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity, are not specifically Jewish laws, binding upon the Israelites only, but reassertions and reenactments of precepts of the moral law, binding upon both Jews and Gentiles, and valid for all times, during and after the Mosaic dispensation. The Gentiles are nowhere said to have incurred divine punishment and defiled the land by not observing the Jewish Sabbath, by letting their cattle gender with a diverse kind, by sowing their fields with mingled seed or wearing garments mingled of linen and woolen,<sup>1)</sup> or by eating pork and other food denied to Israel.

The objection that Lev. 18, 16 and similar statutes could not be considered precepts of the moral law, inasmuch as the moral law admitted of no exceptions, while God himself had ordained an exception from Lev. 18, 16 in the levirate, Deut. 25, 5, is an argument based upon an erroneous view of the moral law. The moral law is not an absolute norm, superior even to the righteous will of God, so that even God must shape his legislative enactments in accordance therewith. God is righteous not inasmuch as he conforms his will and acts to the moral law, but as he is his own moral norm, and the ordinances of his holy will are the norm of right to his subjects. And while there is not in God a change of will,<sup>2)</sup> there may be in him a will to change.<sup>3)</sup> Certain mutual relations of created beings

---

1) Lev. 19, 19.

2) Mal. 3, 6. 1 Sam. 15, 29. Ps. 110, 4. James 1, 17.

3) Gen. 6, 6 f.

were ordained and established by the Creator from the beginning and for all times, and in establishing these relations, God had certain general ends in view. But when for the achievement of these or other general or special ends and purposes he sees fit to ordain ways and means beside or beyond his general ordinances, this does not necessitate or justify the assumption of conflicting wills in God. It is not an inconsistency in God to ordain that brothers and sisters should not intermarry and that Cain should marry his sister, or to punish a brother and his sister for doing to-day what Cain did under divine sanction. And, likewise, the fact that God ordained that in Israel, for a certain end, "If a man died, having no children, his brother should marry his wife, and raise up seed to his brother," is by no means incompatible with the prohibition of marriage with a deceased brother's wife as we find it in Lev. 18, 16 for all cases not covered by Deut. 25, 2, whether among Jews or among Gentiles. The same God who willed the one also willed the other, though not by the same act of volition. And yet the moral law remains a revelation of the immutable will of God. God never willed otherwise than that, certain cases excepted, persons mutually related within certain degrees should not intermarry. And the same God never willed otherwise than that in those cases by himself excepted those whom his will concerned should act accordingly; God never willed otherwise than that Cain should marry his sister and that from the days of Moses to those of John the Baptist the law of the levirate should be observed by the people of Israel in all cases to which that law applied. And in each instance, the will of God was good and just and holy. To dictate to God that if he willed the one he could not will the other is a species of rationalistic presumption based upon crude, unscriptural notions of God and his attributes, and construed by faulty processes of reasoning as unlogical as they are untheological. A. G.

---



## Practical Theology.

---

### ELOCUTION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PULPIT ORATORY.

(Published by Request of Conference.)

Cicero, the famous Roman orator, repeatedly quotes Demosthenes, perhaps the greatest orator the world has ever known, as saying, that in oratory "delivery is the first thing, the second thing, the third thing, and—the whole thing." Cicero, who is quite an authority as far as oratory is concerned, endorses this quaint saying of Demosthenes, as being inherently correct. Taking it *cum grano salis*, and rightly interpreting it, my readers may likewise endorse it. Demosthenes, as every one who has studied his orations, knows, did not exactly mean what he seems to say. He knew that an orator must above all things have something to say; and that this something must be worth saying. Even Demosthenes, with all his oratorical powers, could not have made more out of the soul-stirring poem: "Mary had a little lamb" than there is in it. Imagine him, with powerful voice, with graceful action and gesticulation, with flashing eye and great earnestness of manner, declaiming: "Mary had a little lamb, and oh, how she did love it, but it grew to be an ugly ram, and she made mutton of it." No, the first, second, third, and fourth thing in oratory, is to have a good oration; to have something worth saying; and then *in* saying it, delivery is very important. This is not correcting Demosthenes, but only stating what he really meant to say. Not in *oratory*, but in *elocution*, delivery is the first, second, third, and whole thing. Oratory includes the oration, the *what* is said. Elocution has only to do with the manner of saying it. Elocution ignores the materials composing the pudding, or rather, presupposes them, and then teaches how they may be prepared into palatable food.

Applying these preliminary remarks to pulpit oratory, we learn as our first and most important lesson, to be diligent in preparing a good sermon, to study, meditate, pray, and think, so that we may have something worth saying; something wherewith to instruct and edify our hearers; something wherewith to feed them. The reason why, as Isaiah affirms, an ox and an ass know the crib of their master, is undoubtedly, because they always found something good *in* the crib, not because the crib itself was so beautiful. Let the crib be ornamented with rich carvings, polished and studded with diamonds and gems,—still even the ox of Demosthenes himself would always have decided that the first, second, third, and whole thing was *not* the crib—but the hay, corn, or oats *in* the crib. So it is with elocution. Elocution adorns and beautifies the crib. But woe to the preacher who attempts to feed his audience at an empty crib. In speaking we use the tongue, the lips, the teeth, the throat, and lungs. But all authorities agree that something *else* is of vital importance—of such great importance, that without it no good delivery is possible. It is the *soul*, the heart, the feelings, and emotions. Goethe is disgusted with an orator who has everything else in his favor, a pleasing exterior, a captivating personality, a magnificent voice, graceful action, and highly artistic delivery,—if his heart is not in what he says; if only the mouth makes a noise, if only lungs and tongue and lips are at work. Such an orator, especially if he happened to be a preacher, Goethe called a “*cymbal-tinkling fool*.” To listen to him, produced a similar effect on the great poet as a combination of castor oil, nux vomica, and vermifuge would on an ordinary mortal. He lets Faust say:

“Children and apes will gaze delighted  
If their critiques can pleasure impart.  
But never a heart will be ignited,  
Comes not the spark from the speaker's heart.”

Again he says to all eloquent preachers whose sermons are only lipwork:

“Yes, your discourses that are so refined,  
In which humanity’s poor shreds you frizzle,  
Are unrefreshing as the mist and wind,  
That through the withered leaves of autumn whistle.”

In a like manner, and even more forcibly, Aristoteles, Plato, Cicero, Demosthenes, and all the authorities express themselves. Shakespeare, above all, is most vehement in his denunciation of such “cymbal-tinkling fools” whose orations are only lipwork and only mouthdeep. The professional teachers of elocution claim that it is impossible for a speaker to do justice to his subject unless his heart and soul, his emotions and feelings are also engaged. The heart has great influence on the voice, also on the expression of the face and especially on the eyes and, in fact, on the whole person. If the speaker’s soul is not in sympathy with his speech, not interested in what he says, his speech will always be more or less of a schoolboy’s declamation. It will always resemble the “*saying their piece*” of children on Christmas or on some other festive occasion. It will never exert great influence on an audience. It is not the stove that heats the room, but the fire *in* the stove. Let the stove be ever so grand, ornamented with nickel and silver plating, polished and burnished, till it is as bright as a Venetian mirror. Still, without fire in it, it will dispense no genial warmth. Such a stove would be utterly worthless on such a cold day as this 31st day of January, 1900, happens to be. So it is with the water. Looking at it philosophically, we soon discover the reason. An oration, is *not* so much an address of the lips of the speaker, to the ears of his audience as a communication of what is in the speaker’s soul to the soul of the listener. Now if there is nothing in the soul, what can you communicate? I know that even if there is no water in the well, you can still work the pump handle. But nobody’s thirst will be quenched.

Only the creaking of the pump handle will be heard. A great many orations are nothing else than frantic workings of the pump handle; an abortive attempt to get living water out of a dry soul. All actors of any distinction recognize this as a fundamental principle. They therefore not only memorize, but *study* their parts. They must get into sympathy with the author's feeling. They must, if they would be successful, artificially create the feelings and emotions in their soul, which they are dramatically to represent to the audience. The famous Garrick was once asked by a bishop, how it came that he could move a whole audience to tears, although only representing artificial feeling and fictitious characters and occurrences, whilst he, the good bishop, and so many other preachers, utterly failed to move their audiences. Garrick replied, "We actors speak fiction as though it were truth, whilst you preachers often speak truth as though it were fiction." A Scotch farmer who was a regular church attendant once said to his minister, "You speak of the joys in heaven in such a way as to make me disgusted with them." That minister's soul, evidently, was not in his sermon. Perhaps he was a materialist at heart, an epicure who valued the joys of the table more than the joys of heaven. All great orators owed their greatness mainly to the one fact, that they meant what they said; their heart, their whole soul was in their utterances. Where this is lacking, everything else,—a fine baritone voice, a commanding, captivating personality, polished action, and graceful gesticulation—are of but little value. This is what made Demosthenes a greater orator than Cicero. This gave Whitefield such a phenomenal influence over an audience. His soul was on fire when he spoke. It was the same with Moody.

Applying this principle to pulpit oratory, it teaches that, above everything else, we must always look well into our own heart; that we must always preach to *ourselves* first, always apply the word of warning, reproof, admonition, and also consolation first to our own heart and conscience.

Here it is also true: that it is "not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." It is God the Holy Spirit who with his sanctifying grace must prepare our hearts. We must be anointed from above. We must, therefore, be diligent in prayer, that the Holy Spirit may sanctify our hearts and make us fit instruments for the preaching of the Word. Without the Holy Spirit and his gracious work in our hearts, we can do nothing; we shall never be able to say, "The love of Christ constraineth us," and, "I believed, therefore have I spoken." Not only the preparation, but also the *delivery* of the sermon, requires the gracious assistance of the Holy Spirit, and so this first and most important principle of elocution requires us to bow our knees before the God of all help.

A speech, in the strict sense of the term, exists only in the act of speaking. All that precedes it is preparation for the speech. This preparation ought never to be injurious to the act of speaking. As something very injurious, all the authorities condemn such preparation as would weaken and harm the *act* of speaking. Anything that is injurious to the speaker also injures the speech. A preparation that robs the speaker of a good night's sleep, may also rob the audience of a good speech. The best preparation, not for the speech, but for the act of speaking, so the authorities affirm, is—sleep. For those who have to speak twice in one day, they advise an hour or two of sleep between the two orations. The speaker should always take good care of his health. He should eat wholesome food easily digested. He should breathe God's fresh air every day and—every night too. A minister who has been all Saturday in an overheated study, and then has slept, or rather dozed, in a bedroom where fresh air could by no possibility enter, arising the next morning with a thick head and a beclouded and befogged brain, such a minister, the authorities claim, is physically disabled to do his best in the pulpit. He has detracted about 75 per cent from his sermon, as far as delivery or elo-



cution is concerned. The children of this world are in this respect wiser than the children of light. The stars amongst the actors, such as Garrick, Booth, Mansfield, and others, always were very careful to be in the best condition, physically, when they had to appear before their audiences. They took abundant sleep and rest, exercise in the fresh air, they punched the bag, swung the dumb-bells, and took refreshing baths as necessary preparations.

Talmage, who, although he knows little enough of theology, yet knows a great deal about speaking, follows this recipe. He has his day of rest on Saturday. He claims that ministers, too, must have their day of rest. Saturday he spends as much as possible in the parks and by the seashore, breathing fresh air. Then early to bed. He claims that no minister has any business to be out of bed an hour after supper. The next morning a good bath and a good breakfast, then a little rest on the lounge, and then into the pulpit. Henry Ward Beecher, a man not worthy of being called a preacher of the gospel, yet unquestionably a great orator, had nearly the same rules and lived up to them conscientiously. He says in his advice to theological students: "Never forget that behind all our spirituality there is this great fact of flesh and blood. The body is the spirit's horse. Let the jockey be ever so good, but if he keeps his horse in a poor condition, he cannot win the race. Always keep your horse in a good condition." Something of this commonsense wisdom of the children of this world will also prove beneficial to us who have the high calling to preach the gospel.

Another thing which all the authorities highly recommend is—deep breathing. Ordinary breathing, especially when sitting in our easy chairs in our study, or when engaged in no more violent exercise than walking, which is often the only exercise a minister takes, is not sufficient. Only half of our lungs is exercised by it. Therefore deep breathing is necessary and very beneficial. Special instru-

ments have been invented by physicians, which assist a person in deep breathing. They force you to fill your whole lungs with air. These instruments can be had for the sum of 100 cents. The writer possesses one, and must say that he has received great benefit from it.

Lemon juice applied to the throat externally, and well rubbed in, is very beneficial. It strengthens the nerves and is a great preventer of coughs, hoarseness, and colds. A bath, complete if you can have it, otherwise a spongebath, applied to the upper part of the body, with a few handfuls of salt, and taken regularly every morning, is a wonderful invigorator and will assist greatly in the act of speaking. All these rules have special reference to pulpit oratory only when the preacher applies them, and lives up to them.

We now come to the act or art of speaking itself. Here the authorities are very voluminous. The writer has counted the pages he has waded through. More than 1500. A great deal of it is trash. I have condensed what seemed to me valuable. The first thing to be well remembered, to be taken to heart, and rubbed in deep, is this: *Be natural!* Be your own self! Be what God has made you. Don't try to be somebody else when you are standing before an audience. Speak with your own voice. Don't yell and scream. It is not necessary that we should attempt to raise the dead. Christ will attend to that without our assistance. Let your speaking be speaking, not a declamation, not the reciting of something you have committed to memory, and are now "rattling off" because you have to. Take your time. Beautiful scenery cannot be enjoyed when you are looking out of the windows of a lightning express rushing through space at the rate of 60 miles an hour. Things fly past you in a whirl, and you will be dizzy and bewildered. It is the same with a speech. If the orator fires his ideas and thoughts at the audience as fast as mouth and lips can perform their work, his speech will make no great impression. His audience will be dizzy and bewildered. A slow walk, with the

opportunity of standing still once in a while, is much to be preferred to the best lightning express, when beautiful views are to be enjoyed. So it is with an oration or sermon. As you would speak to your wife and children or friends, especially when you tell them something of a solemn nature, so preach to your congregation, and then you will be about right.

Gesticulation must also be taken into consideration. Cicero calls gesticulation the "*sermo corporis*" and claims that it is in some respects more effective than the spoken word. The old Roman was not very much mistaken. He had learned this wisdom from Roscius, an actor famous for pantomime. Cicero requested an unwelcome stranger to leave the room. The fellow stayed. Roscius, with an expressive gesture, pointed to the door—and the visitor thought it was high time to get out. Gesticulation is natural. All children, when speaking to each other, unconsciously gesticulate. Herbert Spencer says, "A shrug of the shoulders would lose much by translation into words." And Dabney, a teacher of elocution, says, "He who is master of this sign language has indeed an almost magic power. When the orator can combine it with the spoken language, he acquires thereby exceeding vivacity of expression. Not only his mouth, but his eyes, his features, his fingers speak. The hearers read the coming sentiment upon his countenance and limbs almost before his voice reaches their ears; they are both spectators and listeners; every sense is absorbed in charmed attention." The authorities are again so voluminous that the writer is obliged to condense and give everything in a nutshell. In gesticulation the most necessary thing is, "that we be as the little children." Why? Because the gesticulation of little children is free from artificiality and affectation, it is *natural*, corresponding in a natural way to the feelings and emotions of their little souls. Of course, nowadays, the children to be taken as models must be *very* little. As soon as the elocutionary schoolmistress has handled them, they are spoiled. Hope-

lessly spoiled. Generally for life. The first, second, third, and fourth thing in gesticulation is to be natural and not to overdo the thing. It is not necessary to accompany everything you say with a gesture. When speaking of heaven, it is not necessary to always point upwards. A minister who had been invited to preach to the students of a university, said in the course of his address, "You shut your eyes to the beauty of piety," and he shut both his eyes to illustrate the remark. He proceeded, "You stop your ears to the call of the gospel"—he stopped his ears with his fingers. He proceeded, "You turn your back on every thing that is holy"—to illustrate it, he turned his broad back to the audience. That was too much for the boys, and the good done by the well meant sermon was below the freezing point. In suiting the action to the word, this man "overstepped the modesty of nature." All the authorities condemn excessive gesticulation. Too much of it spoils the speech and detracts the attention of the listener. It is like putting too much catsup or mustard on your meat. You spoil the taste of the meat and perhaps do not taste the meat at all. Whitefield was the unsurpassed master of gesticulation. Statesmen, poets, scholars, artists, and actors traveled great distances to hear him and to *see* him speak. Garrick, perhaps the greatest actor the world has ever seen, freely confessed that Whitefield was mountain high above him in dramatic power. And yet there was nothing artificial about Whitefield. He had never taken a single lesson in elocution and he never bestowed a thought on his gestures. They came to him as the bird flies and the fish swims. Lord Bolingbroke once heard him speak about the spiritual blindness of natural man. He illustrated it by speaking of a blind man walking towards an awful abyss. Whitefield brought the man step by step towards the abyss. So naturally did he imitate him, that the whole audience was breathless; they trembled for the blind man and his awful fate. Lord Bolingbroke was so overcome that he

jumped up and yelled, "For God's sake, the man is gone." He described a storm and shipwreck so dramatically, that the sailors in the audience jumped up and cried, "The lifeboat! Quick, take to the lifeboat!" That came natural to Whitefield. We could not imitate him. The rule is not to *express* nature and not to *force* it. To aim not so much at the positive improvement as at the negative, that is to say, at the correction of your faults. Our faults of delivery and gesticulation should be pointed out to us. Every preacher should tell his wife to watch him with a critical eye and to tell him his faults. Correct your mistakes and your faults if possible, but, the authorities add, better let them remain than to be succeeded by artificiality. The professional teachers of elocution have a hundred little rules, but they always come back to the fact, that a speaker must not mind the rules when he speaks, but let nature have its sway. Therefore I will say no more about all these rules. Applied to pulpit oratory we must remember, that we ourselves as God has made us, are called to preach the gospel, and that with our individuality unimpaired but with our faults, as much as possible, corrected, we are to do the work to us appointed. Then, in the fear of God and with love to our fellow-men, let us speak out what we feel and believe. No doubt we will make some blunders. A child can never learn to walk without sometimes falling. But a child will not keep on falling the same way all the time. There will be improvement. So we ought not always to make the same blunders, but try to correct them. Woe to the man who imagines he makes no blunders or that his audience does not see them. Let us be humble and accept all kind or unkind criticisms and profit by them. Above all, let us pray diligently for the anointing from above, so that we may speak acceptably of the wonderful things God has done to save a sinful world; and that not only the sermon but also the delivery of the sermon may redound to the glory of God.

L. ZAHN.



## HINTS FOR SICK-CALLS.

The pastor's faithful care of the sick and dying, for their spiritual wants especially, is of surpassing importance. Right here at the sick bed grand opportunities are offered to the pastor for the achievement of the glorious end and aim of his divine calling. Here especially he can do his work as a minister of the Gospel, for the eternal salvation of the soul of the sick person; but here also he can come into nearer contact with the family, relatives, and friends of the sick, get acquainted with them, get into their confidence, obtain a wholesome influence over them, draw them to the church, instruct or strengthen them in the right path, give them warning or sweet consolation. The good influence of sick-calls made in the right manner and spirit will manifest itself throughout the congregation.

It is obvious, that the pastor, if he wants to be enabled to diligently and faithfully discharge on this portion of his pastoral work, must be and keep himself well posted or informed, regarding sick persons within the boundaries of his charge. In the first place he must know which persons are sick or in a dying condition, needing his spiritual aid, in order that *he can visit them* and attend to their spiritual wants. This might seem almost too insignificant, if we did not know how much a pastor has to contend with ignorance, indifference, backwardness, prejudice, superstition, ill will, etc., regarding information about sick persons. Some people think it their bounden duty to call a doctor or physician for their sick relative and care for his or her bodily welfare at once, but it never occurs to them, that it is their duty also to send for the pastor or to let him know in some way that he is wanted. They take it for granted, that the pastor will hear of the case, — or they even imagine that the pastor ought to know without information, that some one is sick in their house, or they want to find out through the coming or not coming of the unin-

formed pastor if he regards or disregards them; and so precious days or even weeks elapse before the pastor hears about it and is able to make the often very necessary call. Others are restrained from calling the pastor at once to a sick relative or friend, by backwardness, bashfulness, or timidity. They do not want to impose on their pastor, or do not want to bother him, they think it asking too much of the pastor, to visit their lowly hut, they think themselves not worthy, or that they have no right to call the pastor, and moved by such thoughts either do not come at all, or wait to the last minute. Others again do not inform the pastor because the superstitious notion has taken hold upon them: If we call the pastor our dear relative will not recover from illness but must die. Some do not want a pastor to come and — as they put it — bother and disquiet and torment the sick person by speaking about spiritual things, the salvation of the soul, death, heaven, and hell. There are even those who do not want to give the pastor the necessary information, because they want to have the charge against him that he is not faithful, etc.

Well, what then is a faithful pastor to do, to surmount all these obstacles and in spite of them to be well informed and thus enabled to make these very important calls and care for the poor sick by the grace of God? A few hints may suffice. Above all, the pastor of course will instruct his congregation regarding this point. He will inculcate upon his congregation in general, husbands, wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children, relatives, neighbors, or to whom such knowledge may come, the Christian duty to notify the pastor in good time when a member of the family, a relative, friend, or neighbor, has fallen ill. This can be done and ought to be done in sermons at public worship. Occasion for such instruction and exhortation is given abundantly in our pericopes, for instance, in such gospel lessons where Christ Jesus' care for the sick is brought before us, where that poor mother implores the Lord to heal her

daughter, where the centurion seeks help for his servant, — where the neglect of the poor sick Lazarus on the part of the rich man is pictured before our eyes. Also during catechetical examinations such occasions are found. In congregational meetings, when care for the indigent and sick is under discussion, the pastor must not let the good occasion pass by without emphatically reminding the members of this important duty to call him in good time to the bed of sick persons. In the meetings of women's societies, young ladies' societies, young men's societies, in private conversations the pastor should seize the opportunity to speak about and explain the importance of this duty. Speak about it to the children in the school and in the Sunday School. Always hold it up to the members of the congregation that the pastor is very anxious and willing to come and devote his time and care to the sick, and that they should assist and enable him to do so. Tell them that the pastor can not know who is sick, as he does not know every thing, — just as little as the doctor, and that it is their duty just as well to call the pastor, as to call the physician.

Frequent inquiry should also be made by the pastor as to the state of health, in the family and neighborhood, when meeting a member of the congregation. A leading thread to other sick-beds may be often found in the house and at the bedside of some sick person. Do not wait for notice or an invitation if in any way you find out or hear that some one is sick in your congregation, especially if you know, that the patient's spiritual condition is not as it ought to be. Lay special stress upon making sick-calls, let the people, especially the sick, see and feel that you willingly and with great pleasure look after the sick, *at any time*, day or night, rain or shine, even if they are afflicted and stricken with horrible or contagious diseases. Let them know that you rather risk being called unnecessarily, than to have them fear to call upon you in such

cases, and in time you will see that you are more readily assisted in obtaining information regarding the sick.

If the congregation is very numerous and patients are many, be careful to have a correct list of them, putting the most serious cases at the head, and make regular rounds, as often as time permits you to do so. This rule applies also to the very old and weak persons who are unable to attend public services,—or can do so very seldom.

Always be *well prepared* for making sick-calls. In order to be well prepared to come to a patient not with uncouth hands, mark down for your use at sick-calls some portions of Scripture seeming to you especially adapted for sick persons in various spiritual or bodily conditions. Commit to memory in order to have them at command at any time, some passages of Scripture adapted for people without self-knowledge, or knowledge of sin or Christian doctrine, for down-stricken, despairing souls, containing the sweet comfort of the Gospel in a few lines which are full of consolation, setting forth the love and grace of our Lord Jesus for poor sinners, cheering words for those suffering great bodily pain, or in the agony of death, ringing with triumph over death, and joy of eternal life. Also commit to memory a good number of suitable verses from church hymns particularly suitable for sick or dying persons, also diligently look over approved prayers of faithful ministers for and in behalf of the sick. Ask God for wisdom and patience, for a sympathizing and merciful heart for the sick and afflicted, for love of them and zeal for their eternal welfare, for knowledge to understand their conditions and the right word to really benefit them. Never, even in the most urgent case, neglect preparation, even when on the way, by prayer for the Lord's guidance and blessing and calling into memory texts and verses.

As soon as you have entered the house of the patient, do not neglect, after courteously greeting the wife, or the husband, or the children, or the friends, of the sick person,

to give utterance to some words of sympathy—probably in the way of old Pastor N.: “Good day, Mrs. M. I hear that your husband (child) is sick, and I came to call on him. I feel very sorry for you and heartily sympathize with you in your affliction. Let us trust that all will be well. The Lord will provide. We know our heavenly Father has everything in His hand, nothing will befall you against His will, and He certainly will deal with you even in this tribulation as a loving Father. Do not despair, but look up to the mountains from which sure help comes to us. Mary, George, I am glad to see you, but am sorry, at the same time, that this our meeting is caused by the illness of your dear father. Let us hope for the best. Mrs. M., will you please show me to the sick-bed of your dear husband?”—When leaving, also give some consoling words (according to circumstances) to the relatives.—When, arriving at a sick-bed, you are informed that the patient is unconscious already, has given no signs of consciousness even for hours, do not think that everything is in vain now, that nothing can be done any more. There is a possibility, even a probability, that the patient will yet hear and understand you. To corroborate this assertion, two examples may suffice.

When coming to the sick-bed of a member of my congregation, after having been absent from home, I was informed that the patient had given no signs of consciousness for 36 hours, that they thought he would no longer hear or understand anything. In spite of these assertions, I leaned towards the ear of the sick man, and in a loud and steady voice spoke the words of some comforting passages of Scripture and some verses from a hymn and a brief prayer. The man recovered so far on the second day after this, that he was able to speak, and afterwards regained his health. He then told me that he had plainly heard—as from a long distance—the voices of his wife and brother, telling me that he was quite unconscious,—but had been unable to give the least sign of consciousness; and also that he very plainly,



though as from a distance, had heard what I had spoken into his ear. In order to obtain certainty, I asked, what I had said, whereupon he repeated the two passages of Scripture, one verse of the hymn, and part of the prayer.

At another time I was called to the sick-bed of a man I had never seen before. On arriving at the house and while stepping up to the couch of the patient, I was told that he had been sick for five days and unconscious for about nine hours. Nevertheless I spoke into the ear of the man what I thought necessary for him at the gates of death. The man recovered so far that I had more than a week's time to prepare him for the last journey. When I found him fully conscious and able to talk at the next call, he said: "Pastor, I heard you speak to me yesterday." "Did you?" I replied; "well, then, what did I say?" "I can not repeat just every word," he answered, "but I know that you said *all* were sinners, but that the blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God cleanseth us from all sins, that He is the propitiation for our sins, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish in death but have everlasting life, and that God loved us poor sinners, that He gave His Son for us to save us from death and eternal damnation." This convinced me that the man indeed very plainly had heard and understood my words, though he seemed to be quite unconscious at the time.

Even if patients never regain consciousness or strength enough to bear testimony, it certainly is the better way to speak to them in a manner which circumstances may require.

C. L. J.

---

## SERMON OUTLINES.

**Outline of a Confessional Sermon on John 1, 16.**

How freely does God love the world! John 3, 16. While we were yet sinners, enemies, "Christ died for the ungodly." While we were "dead in sin," God "spared not His own Son," etc. Rom. 8, 32. And how freely with Him does He "give us all things!" "Grace for Grace!"

## ON FREE GRACE.

## The grace of God

## I.

*Is free in all.*

a. It does not depend on any power or merit in man; no, not in any degree, neither in whole nor in part. Rom. 9, 16. It does not in any wise depend either on the good works or righteousness of the receiver; not on any thing he has done, or any thing he is. 2 Tim. 1, 9. It does not depend on man's endeavors. It does not depend on his good desires, or good purposes and intentions; for all these flow from the free grace of God; they are the streams only, not the fountain. They are the fruits of free grace, and not the root. They are not the cause, but the effects of it.

b. Whatsoever good is in man, or is done by man, God is the author of it. 1 Cor. 15, 10. Rom. 11, 6. Thus is God's grace free in all; that is, in no way depending on any power or merit in man, but on God alone, who freely gave us His Son, and "with Him freely giveth us all things"—the victory over the devil, sin, death, and hell, as well as the gift of heaven, righteousness and eternal life, is ours; yea, all things are ours now, because we have the Son as our gift, in whom all else is comprehended. (Luther.) Of His overflowing fullness have we all received whatever we possess, as men, as Christians; and He has given us even grace for grace, or *grace upon grace* (χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος), a rich abundance and variety of favors, which will ever make His name most precious to our souls. Luke 1, 46—50.

II.

*Is free for all.* "We all received," etc.

a. God sincerely desires to have mercy upon all men; He wills that all should be saved and that none should perish. Ezek. 33, 11. John 3, 16. 1 Tim. 2, 4. 2 Pet. 3, 9. Rom. 11, 33. John 6, 37. Rom. 10, 12, 13; 5, 20. Is. 1, 18.

b. Christ Jesus is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, that is, the whole human race, one and all, without any exception. (Luther.) Christ is the Savior of all men. 1 John 2, 1, 2. 1 Tim. 4, 10; 2, 5, 6. 2 Pet. 2, 1. John 1, 26. 1 John 1, 7b. 2 Cor. 5, 14, 15. John 4, 42.

c. The Gospel should be preached to every creature, to the end that all men everywhere should repent and come to the knowledge of the truth. Mark 16, 15, 16. Acts 17, 30. Matt. 22, 2—9. Luke 19, 41.

d. God calls all to the benefits of Christ, with the sincere will that all should become partakers. Matt. 11, 28. Is. 55, 1, 2.

Come, ye wanderers, one and all,  
Come, ye all have invitation;  
Come, obey His gracious call,  
Come and take His free salvation.—

Grace! 'tis a charming sound,  
Harmonious to the ear;  
Heaven with the echo shall resound,  
And all the earth shall hear.

Grace first contrived a way  
To save rebellious man;  
And all the steps that grace display,  
Which drew the wondrous plan.

*Free grace is all in all, and for all! Amen.*

J. C. A.

---

**Outline of a Mission Sermon on Mark 16, 15, 16.**

The word *mission* is taken from the Latin language, and means *to send*. To send a message or a messenger. As the church uses the word it means the sending of the means of grace to those who have them not.

## CHRIST'S PARTING COMMISSION AND PROMISE.

Mark:—

## I.

*Christ's parting commission.* Observe1. *The person giving the commission.*

a. Not a man or worldly king;

b. but our dear Lord Jesus Christ, v. 15. "And *He* said," etc., see v. 9. — Phil. 2, 9—11. — Matt. 28, 18—20. — He who saith, "Go," came into this world. He who saith, "Go ye," Himself came; came not by deputy or proxy, but Himself came. Gal. 4, 4. He is the manifestation of the love of God; the Christ who died for the ungodly; the Jesus who was born to save, and whom God hath exalted. He who saith, "Go into the world to every creature," is the propitiation for the sins of the world. John 1, 29.

2. *The commission itself*, v. 15. "Go ye . . . creatures."

These words present three objects:—

a. *Work.* Matt. 20, 1 ff. The work is preaching the Gospel. — *Preach* = proclaim, make known, tell. — Luke 2, 17. 38; 8, 39. Matt. 28, 7. John 1, 41—46. Ps. 40, 10; 66, 16; 71, 17. 18. — The *Gospel*, that is, the good news and glad tidings of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. — Christ Jesus is the author, substance, and the end of the Gospel. John 3, 16. Rom. 1, 16.

b. The *sphere* and *field* of work. "Into all the world, — to every creature." — The dispensation of divine mercy had for a time been chiefly confined to one people and to one land. Matt. 10, 5. 6; 15, 24. — But now their commission is enlarged, and they are authorized to go to the uttermost parts of the earth, and preach the Gospel to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews; to every creature that is capable of receiving it. Luke 14, 21—23; 24, 46. 47. Acts 13, 46; 10, 34. 35. Matt. 28, 19. Ezek. 33, 11. John 3, 16. 1 Tim. 2, 4. 2 Pet. 3, 9. Rom. 11, 32. John 6, 37. 1 John 2, 1. 2. 1 Tim. 4, 10; 2, 5. 6. John 1, 29. Matt. 11, 28; 22, 2—9. Luke 19, 41.

(Application: Home mission. Foreign mission.)

c. The *workmen*, persons, by whom this work should be accomplished. "Go ye."

1. The apostles. They well understood the nature and extent of this commission. Mark 16, 20.

2. All Christians. To this hour, the charge of our divine Master is in full force; it has never been repealed.

*a.* It is, indeed, pre-eminently the vocation of all Christian ministers. *β.* It is the duty of every Christian. 1 Pet. 2, 9.

—Let us, therefore, be faithful to our responsibilities; let us care for all; let us erect and maintain churches and schools; let us cheerfully support teachers, ministers, and missionaries; let us cheerfully give toward missions. Each accordingly! Gal. 6, 9. 10. Home and foreign missions!

## II.

### *Christ's parting promise.*

1. *The promise*, v. 16. Eternal salvation to all that believe and are baptized.

*a. Baptism*, a means of Grace, and the gospel in general, works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation. The word and sacraments, the instrument or means through which the Holy Ghost works and accomplishes all this.

*b. Faith*, that is, a firm confidence in the mercy and love of God, is the hand, the receptacle (*der rechte Beutel oder Sack*—Luther), into which we should receive and in which we should keep the gift of God, eternal salvation. Rom. 10, 7. 1 Pet. 1, 5.

### *2. The design, end, purpose of this promise.*

*a.* It should serve as an admonition. John 20, 27.

*b.* It should serve as an exhortation and encouragement to missionary work, both at home and abroad.—He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Remembering these words, let us be unwearied in trying to do good to the souls of all mankind. Gal. 6, 9. 10. 1 Cor. 15, 58. Is. 55, 10. 11.

J. C. A.



### Outline of a Mission Sermon on 1 Cor. 15, 58.

Let us, dear Christians, see in these words of St. Paul the strongest argument in favor of missionary work, both at home (domestic) and abroad (foreign). Remembering these words of St. Paul, the great missionary, let us be unwearied in doing good to the souls of all mankind. Let us cheerfully labor on, unmoved by the sneers and taunts of those who disapprove missionary operations. We may well pity such people. They only show their great ignorance, both of Scripture and of God's holy will and command.

WHY SHOULD IT ALWAYS BE OUR HEART'S DESIRE TO  
SAVE SOULS?

Because the apostle tells us in our text:—

#### I.

*Always abound in the work of the Lord.* In our text the apostle exhorts the Christians at Corinth and us

a. To be about the work of the Lord. *a.* What is the work of the Lord? It is to bring immortal souls to Jesus. Save souls. Preach the Gospel. Destroy the devil's kingdom and build God's kingdom. *β.* But who should do the work of the Lord? Not only the teachers and ministers, but all Christians. 1 Pet. 2, 9. Matt. 5, 16. Is. 40, 9; 43, 21. Think not we have our missionaries, our teachers and preachers, let them do it. The Holy Ghost exhorts *you* to be about the Lord's work. But more:—

b. Abound in the Lord's work. The Lord could accomplish His work without us, without any human means and instruments by His own infinite power, or through His angels. But what great honor does the Lord confer upon us, by choosing us sinners for this work. Therefore, cheerfully abound in the Lord's work. Daily search the Scriptures. Erect and maintain schools and churches. Urge your neighbors to come to church. Lead and bring their children to the Good Shepherd by bringing them to your

church-school. Support missionaries. Give toward missions. Thousands of our fellow-men are still walking in darkness, for whom our dear Savior also shed His precious blood. Mark 16, 15. Therefore, abound in the work of the Lord. More:—

c. Abound in it always. Be unwearied! Labor on, unmoved by those who disapprove missionary operations, collections, etc. Pray for missions; cheerfully give toward them, accordingly. Do not think: I did my share; let others, etc.; I did enough, etc. Always abound! Let it always be your heart's desire to save souls, blood-bought, immortal souls. But do it more cheerfully since the apostle tells you.

## II.

*Ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.*

a. Our earthly or temporal labors are very often in vain. Luke 5, 5. James 5, 4.

b. But how is it concerning our labor in the Lord?  
 α. It often seems in vain! A failure! It very often is a difficult labor! Connected with great hardships. The ungodly laugh and sneer at it. The devil and our old Adam also opposes the work of the Lord. β. But it only *seems* as if our labor in the Lord was in vain! It *is* not in vain! Is. 55, 11.—And remember how the Lord blessed the labor, the missionary work, of our dear forefathers in this country; and how the Lord is still blessing our missionary work, in this and other countries.—Germany, Australia, India, England, etc. Our labor in the Lord is never in vain! We know this!—

Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord. Amen.

J. C. A.

## Outline of a Mission Sermon on Ps. 142, 4 b.

*"No man cared for my soul."*

By an assembly like the present, it will readily be admitted that the care of the soul is the most serious concern, and the most momentous subject that can possibly occupy the thoughts, interest the feelings, or command the exertions of human beings in the present world.—Nor is it enough that, by the grace of God, we work out *our own* salvation with fear and trembling; for the care of the souls of *others*, also, is a duty of indispensable obligation—a duty which no Christian can consistently neglect.—Can it be, shall it be, that we who possess the pure and full Gospel of Christ, can think of the myriads of immortal souls who still remain in darkness and the shadow of death, and yet be unconcerned for their salvation?! Shall they continue to pour forth into heedless ears the heart-rending cry, "No man careth for our souls"? God forbid! it must not be, and it can not be!

## ON CARING FOR THE SOULS OF MEN.

Consider:—

## I.

*What the care for the souls of men involves.*

Let us not suppose that the care for others is to supersede any anxiety respecting our own souls. To be solicitous for the salvation of others will not avail us personally, if we are careless in regard to our own salvation.—Nor can we properly care for the souls of others till we care for our own souls.—The care for other men's souls involves

a. A deep and heart-felt conviction of the great value of a soul. It is absolutely necessary to feel this conviction; for no reasons can and will induce us to care for souls if we believe them to be of no value. Men generally proportion their care to the greatness of the object of their regard. We might speak of the value of property, of liberty, of

health, of friendship, of life. But what are all these things put together when compared with the unutterable worth of one blood-bought, immortal soul. Matt. 16, 26. Mark 8, 36. 37.—Such is the worth of one single soul, O what care do souls demand!—

b. Alarming apprehensions of the great dangers to which souls are exposed. We are not in the habit of caring much, or anxiously, even for what is highly valuable, if we believe it perfectly secure. When danger threatens, then we show our concern.—If the souls of men are not in danger, our anxiety for their safety is uncalled for and, indeed, needless. But what is the fact? Souls are in the most imminent danger! The peril is greater than any language can express. 1 Pet. 5, 8. 1 Cor. 10, 12.

c. Intense anxiety and tender solicitude must be involved in this care for the souls. If such be their surpassing worth, and such their alarming danger, it is evident that our perishing fellow-sinners claim an interest in our deepest sympathy. Love of souls should surely find a place in our hearts; and where this emotion prevails, we must display it by our intense zeal for their salvation. Matt. 22, 39; 7, 12. Luke 10, 25—37.—Think of Jesus, how He cared for our souls!—“Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.”—

d. This care includes active, zealous, liberal exertions to promote their salvation. This implies that we must show our sense of the value of souls by our actual conduct, and personal efforts in their behalf. We must look after the wandering, the stray, and do all that we can to bring them back.—If you truly care for souls, why are they left to perish? Why do you not send them the Gospel? Why do you not pray for them?—Erect and maintain Christian schools and churches. Support the ministry of the Gospel. Give toward missions!—Send the good tidings to the heathen.

## II.

*On whom this duty devolves?*

The care of souls devolves on every Christian, according to our various situations and circumstances.

a. It is especially incumbent on the heads of families to care for the souls of their children. When God gives a child, He gives this charge to its parents: Exod. 2, 9. Eph. 6, 4. Deut. 6, 6—9.

b. It is the vocation of all ministers to care for the souls of the people committed to their charge.

c. It is a duty of every Christian to care for the souls of his fellow-men. Mark 16, 15. (Application: Home mission. Mission abroad.) Let us, therefore, be faithful to our responsibilities; let us care for all! 1 Pet. 2, 9.

J. C. A.

---



## Theological Review.

---

**The Apostolic Age, its life, doctrine, worship and polity,**  
*by James Vernon Bartlet, M. A. New York, Charles*  
*Scribner's Sons. MDCCXCIX. 542 pages. Price,*  
*\$1.00.*

The author of this volume has had the good fortune to see the most important period of Christian history assigned to him by the publishers of the *Ten Epochs of Church History*, at the same time that period which affords the most reliable sources of information available in all the range of historical research. But our impression is that the special studies he made after the task was committed to his hands did not rest upon a basis of sufficient theological and historical breadth and depth. We fail to find in the book that ripeness of theological scholarship which alone can secure the best products of authorship in church history. This may also account for the fact that a number of points to which the reader who is familiar with the field will spontaneously turn when he takes up a new book are either passed by entirely or merely touched upon with an unconcern that betokens a lack of interest in the problems lying along the author's path. On the other hand, we feel agreeably relieved as, by a survey of the book, we have ascertained that the author is not of a stripe with those modern theological novelists who endeavor to palm off their fictions as results of scientific research. Mr. Bartlet does not exhibit the marks of a theologian which are indispensable to a full and adequate appreciation of the apostolic age also in its historical aspects. But we have long since accustomed ourselves to look to others than modern theologians for that measure of fairness which secular historians are wont to exercise in the use of original sources of historical information, when the apostles and evangelists are

to be called on the stand to testify to what they have seen and heard and done. It has become a matter of course that modern theologians treat the *Acts* as a production very much akin to Sallust's narrative of the Catilinarian conspiracy or a modern campaign document, and that St. Luke and St. Paul, to obtain a hearing, must turn to lawyers and philologists and other non-theologians, who are apt to treat them at least as veracious gentlemen, and this is the treatment they experience at the hand of Mr. Bartlet. While the work is very unsatisfactory theologically, and in need of much correction historically, and far from what it ought to be generally, yet we are grateful to the publishers of the series for having kept from us the curse of another treatment of the Apostolic Age by a prominent scientific theologian.

Among the grievances we have against Mr. Bartlet's book we mention but a few. Of the chief historical categories, *persons*, *events*, and *institutions*, not one is properly handled. We obtain, from these pages, no well characterized picture of St. Paul, St. Peter, St. John; no adequate view of the persecutions of the apostolic age; no clean cut notions of the early churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, Rome, of public worship, church government and discipline, public and private beneficence, education, domestic life and relations, the attitude of the church toward the social problems of the age, in apostolic days. We find erroneous statement concerning baptism and the eucharist, Christian faith and doctrine.

From what we deem best in form and substance between the covers of our author's book we give the following specimens.—

“Before tracing the later religious tribes that coexisted in Judaism when Christianity came to birth we must notice certain great beliefs more or less entertained by the Jews at large. It was natural that after a long and weary period of national servitude the acquired bend of mind among the Jews at the dawn of the second century

B. C. should be one of eager expectancy toward the future. As they dwelt on their past glories the glowing promises of a future prosperity yet more worthy of Jehovah's covenant with their race—contrasting so sadly with the leaden skies of their present national experiences—caused them to project their thoughts constantly into the future. They strove to catch the first gleams of that Day of Jehovah, the great intervention of God in human history which should close the 'latter days' of the old era of the mixed cup, and usher in the new age of unmingled blessing, righteousness and world-wide influence for the Chosen People, the agent of Jehovah's universal reign. There were, to the pious Jew, immense arrears of anomaly calling for Divine rectification, both by way of retribution on the evil and consolation of the righteous. Providence was sadly in need of a supreme vindication in Israel and that in the eyes of all peoples. This attitude of soul may be called, in respect of its pre-occupation with the Last Things, of Judgment and Reward, eschatological; in respect of the characteristics of the new order to be brought in, or of the prime agent sometimes conceived to be necessary to its introduction, Messianic. Under the former aspect, the specific idea involved in the ideally holy and happy state of the Church-nation (which was the end of ends in either case) was that of Resurrection; under the latter, the Messianic Kingdom and the Messiah.

"The Messianic hope is so vast a theme that we can but allude to it. But it is needful to say with all the emphasis, which our growing knowledge of the later Judaism warrants, that it was by no means uniform in nature, either as between several marked eras (from 200 B. C. to 70 A. D.), or as between various religious circles within any given era; nor did it always contemplate a personal Messiah. Primarily the Messianic 'Kingdom' had come to mean simply the ideal state of Israel as the Chosen People, amid whom Jehovah should be manifestly present in blessing. *Immanuel*, 'God with us,' was its key-note; and its condition was perfect fidelity to the Covenant regulating Jehovah's relations with His people. Hence there were two ways of looking at it, according to the tendency of a man's piety. If one looked at the Covenant from the side of man's obligation, then the day of perfect obedience seemed but a shadowy and ever remote possibility, behind which lay concealed the full favor of Jehovah, His manifest coming to His Temple and Land. If, on the other hand, one regarded the Covenant through the boundless and unknown possibilities of Jehovah's loving kindness, shown on many an occasion of human shortcoming—then, ah! then, with

trembling hope and fear the soul might expect large things of its God. To the former alternative it was the tendency of legalist and pessimist minds to lean, and to have no really effective Messianic Hope. To the latter inclined the pious souls, whose breathings reach us in many a psalm, and whose spiritual children have left some record of their trust, now vivid, now faint, as it animates the 'Psalms of Solomon' (a voice from the better sort of Pharisees, about 63—45 B. C.) and some other parts of the Apocrypha, but especially the apocalyptic literature extending over the whole period B. C. 200—A. D. 70." (pp. XXVI ff.)

"So far we have dealt with certain great streams of thought in later Judaism. We have yet to consider the various religious types coexisting in the unity of the sacred 'Commonwealth of Israel' when the Forerunner began that sifting of Israel, which the Greater One was to carry to the decisive issue. The essentials of Judaism at that time are well summed up in the saying of Simeon the Righteous, uttered two centuries before and preserved among the 'Sayings of the Fathers' (*Pirge Aboth*) committed to writing about as long after the Christian era. 'On three things the world is stayed: on the Torah (Law), on the Worship, and on the bestowal of kindnesses.' According as the accent falls on each of these in succession, we have the Pharisee, the Sadducee, and the popular Saint—using this phrase for want of a better, to express the genuine successor of the pious or 'meek' ones of the Psalter.

"The thoroughgoing Pharisees relied on the Torah as developed and codified by the dicta of a series of great Scribes and Doctors into 'the tradition of the Elders.' This divine code covered the whole area of daily life, fixing, often by most painful casuistry, what was allowable and unallowable (things 'loosed' and 'bound'), and what was clean and unclean. The great evil of the system lay in its subordination of moral to ceremonial considerations, where these come into competition. It was this that most roused Christ's righteous indignation: for it lay at the root of their self-complacent 'hypocrisy.' Moral goodness as such did not concern them as a class: if 'mercy and truth' were praiseworthy, it was as part of the sacred national code. We speak now of the extremists of this school who perhaps amounted to only some 6000 in all Palestine (mainly Judaea). But the baneful influence of a compact and zealous brotherhood such as they formed, upon the religious ideals of their nation was very far-reaching. For they had the prestige of learning, as well as of rigorous scrupulosity in pursuance of the national ideals of Righteousness and Purity—a term whose ambiguity masked the deep

differences latent in current Judaism. Besides emptying these great words of most of their moral contents, Pharisaic piety debased the motives of the godly life by language that narrowed down Jehovah's Covenant relation to the terms of a legal contract, unto which both the better and worse kind counted upon an unknown quantity entering at last 'the merits of the Fathers.' This was the one form in which the typical Pharisee knew anything of humility. When all else failed he counted on pleading, 'But I have Abraham as a father. Can a circumcised Jew really be damned like a Gentile dog? Where then is the advantage of being a Jew?' On other occasions, indeed, when it was the time to 'despise others,' the profane vulgar who cared not for the traditions of the elders, 'the publicans and sinners,' the outcasted, as it were, in Israel—then, it was all too easy to ignore the value of the Abrahamic origin and let brethren go to join the other 'dogs.' Obviously there were deep cleavages in Judaism, and we must be careful not to think loosely about 'the Jews,' as if they were homogeneous, when we come to consider the early Jewish Christians.

"The Sadducees call for less notice, since there is little room for doubt as to their attitude to all Christians. It was one of severe aloofness. In Christ's day at least the Sadducees were mainly identified with the high-priestly aristocracy that controlled the Temple-worship, and in the absence of any native prince (i. e., the various semi-Jewish Herods) were also the leaders in the State, the dominant party in the Sanhedrin, the supreme native court under the Roman governor (*procurator*). In religion, like most aristocracies, they were both 'moderates' and conservatives. They refused, that is, to accept the advance on the Pentateuch represented not only by the Prophets and Psalms, but also by 'the traditions of the Elders,' on the one hand and by the Messianic and Apocalyptic beliefs of popular religion on the other. The former threatened their own privileged position as superintendents of the national worship centring in the Temple and the sacrificial system by the encroachments of sacred jurists, the recognized custodians of a written body of revealed Law, which they could make speak as they willed. The latter they despised as superstitious and feared as a constant source of fanatical attempts to innovate on the humiliating political situation, which for many reasons it was their own policy to maintain for the present at least. Hence it was they who took the lead in the early attempts to reduce the Apostles to silence, lest public order be upset, possibly to the extent of bringing the Romans on the scene. Probably the nearest approximation to their religious attitude known to us, is to be found in the sceptical 'Preacher' of the book of Ecclesiastes.



"Very different was the spirit of the third of the sects which Josephus recognizes as existing in Palestinian Judaism. The Essenes, whatever their origin and whatever the exact meaning of their name, were far closer to the Pharisees than to the Sadducees, both in their passion for purity after the standards of the Mosaic Law, and in the subordinate place which they gave to the Temple and its cultus. Indeed, in this latter respect they far outdid all other Jews, since, in some way not perfectly clear to us, they regarded the bloody sacrifices even of the Temple as defiling, and were content to rely solely upon other kinds of sacrifice, such as their common meals—which were partaken of with great solemnity and regard to ritual purity. To these they added those once secondary 'sacrifices' which had through the language of prophets and psalmists, echoed also by the 'Wisdom' literature, advanced in many devout Jewish minds into the primary place, as the most congenial forms of homage to a God such as they conceived the High and Holy One of Israel to be. These were the sacrifices of praise, of prayer, of fasting—the sacrifice of the 'broken and contrite heart'—of active charity and almsgiving. The peculiar communistic life, indeed of the stricter type of Essenes (who were also celibates), living near the Dead Sea, gave such sacrifices special forms. They regarded their refectory as their temple, the senior brethren as priests, from whom also they learned certain esoteric doctrines extracted from the generally received Jewish Scriptures and from their own special sacred writings, both mystical and apocalyptic in character. Specimens of some of their teachings probably survive in sections of the *Book of Enoch*, dating from the second and first centuries B. C. Other aspects of it were probably never committed to writing, being handed down only orally under most awful vows of secrecy. We know, however, from Josephus, who lived several years among them as one of those only on probation, that they had a very definite doctrine of the Future Life, combining apparently the doctrines of a Resurrection and of the Immortality of the Soul, usually rivals rather than allies in contemporary Judaism. But while they were in some sense eclectic in their ideals, we cannot be sure of the sources whence they derived or of the principles by which they harmonized their views. In any case they were fundamentally Jewish in their religious spirit and in many of its manifestations, though their asceticism goes beyond anything warranted by the Jewish notion of 'purity,' and points to an alien dualistic view of matter and spirit.

"Akin to the Essenes, at least as regards their conception of brotherly kindness as the ritual of the religion of a pure heart, was

a fourth group, which Josephus omits to mention: for in truth it was not a sect at all. It has for us the greatest interest of all, since from it came the bulk of the first Christians, those whose type of piety must have determined the Jewish Christianity of the earlier chapters of Acts. Though perhaps the most numerous of all the four types we have mentioned, it is most apt to escape notice, because it does not appear explicitly in literature. It was not, indeed, a literary class; its members are known, in so far as they are known at all, as 'the quiet of the land.' But they have in fact their literary embodiment. It is the spirit of their piety that breathes through the gracious narratives of Luke I and II. Zacharias, Elizabeth, Mary, Joseph, Simeon and Anna, are all, with minor differences, examples of this type of piety, the genuine outcome of Old Testament religion, i. e., of the Law read through the prophets and modified and expanded in its ethics by Psalmists and the best of the 'Wisdom' writers. Its religious ideal was that of Micah (VI, 8), when he cried, 'What doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?' In its more outward aspects it finds yet fuller expression in words of Zechariah (VII, 9, 10): 'Execute true judgement and show mercy and compassion every man to his brother; and oppress not the widow, nor the fatherless, the stranger, nor the poor; and let none of you imagine evil against his brother in his heart.' What this means may be seen in greater detail in Job, chap. XXXI. It is the Law as the Wise set it before their scholars in Proverbs and in kindred books of instruction. And finally, and most significantly, it coincides with the preaching of the last of the prophets, John the Baptist, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, who was all but within the kingdom which he announced." (pp. XXI ff.)

---

**Schriftgemaesse und erbauliche Erklarung der Offenbarung St. Johannis** von G. Gösswein. St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1900. 314 pages, bound in half-Morocco; price, \$1.25.

This is a truly theological exposition of the Apocalypse, interpreting Scripture by Scripture, those parts which are less clear, in the light of clearer parts and passages, always in harmony with the established doctrine of Scripture, never satisfied with mere exposition, but ever mindful of the profitableness of the Scriptures for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, for comfort

and consolation. It is an edifying book, not only for the theologian, but also for the general reader. There are a few historical points in which we beg leave to differ with the author. We have, to say the least, our serious doubts concerning "the conversion of Constantine." We date popery considerably earlier than A. D. 600. But these matters are of no consequence theologically and we do not, on their account, restrict our estimate and recommendation of the book as a highly commendable work. A. G.

---

**Explanation of Luther's Small Catechism.** *Based on Dr. Erik Pontoppidan. By Rev. H. U. Sverdrup, formerly pastor of Balestrand parish, Norway. Abridged Edition. Translated from the Norwegian by Prof. E. G. Lund, D. D. Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House. 128 pages. Price, 25 cents.*

The book upon which this Explanation of the best Catechism ever made is based has been held in high esteem by Norwegian Lutherans at home and in foreign lands, and the translation of the abridged edition has been creditably performed. But the book as it is now before us is open to several strictures. We have no reason to mention them all; but we have reason for pointing out a few.—In our time and country, when the Lutheran doctrine of the Sabbath as set forth in the Augsburg Confession has been branded as an *error*, and the false, Judaizing doctrine of the divine obligation of the Sabbath is maintained as a distinctive doctrine of American Lutheranism, it is highly misleading and little short of denial of the truth to publish, in a new Catechism for English speaking Lutherans, an exposition of the Third Commandment as that contained in this book. The whole series of questions and answers on the subject, Qq. 51—55, while they may admit of a correct meaning, are sure to convey an un-Lutheran sense under the prevailing circumstances, especially when the form of the Commandment itself is, *Remember the Sabbath day to keep*

*it holy*, a form to which we also object in a Lutheran catechism.<sup>1)</sup>—Questions 170—174 are out of place where they are in their present form, confounding, as they do, the work of universal redemption as performed by Christ the Savior in his state of humiliation, and the appropriation of the benefit of the redemption to the believer which should come under the Third Article.<sup>2)</sup>—Regeneration must not be in-

1) *51. Which is the day of rest among Christians?*

The first day of the week, on which Christ rose from the dead.

*52. How are we to keep the day of rest holy?*

1. We should lay aside our daily labor, with the purpose of using the time for our edification in the fear of the Lord.

2. We should devoutly hear and meditate upon God's Word, as well at home as more especially at church.

*53. Has God given us days of rest only that we may hear and meditate upon His Word?*

No; He has also given us such days in order that body and soul may obtain the rest they need.

*54. How do we profane the day of rest?*

1. When we despise God's Word.

2. When we do such deeds, or take part in such amusements, as either are sinful in themselves, or, at any rate, draw our hearts away from God.

*55. Is then no outward work allowed on Sunday?*

Yes; any work of real necessity which cannot be delayed, and deeds of love to our neighbor. Luke 14, 1—6.

2) Questions 170—174, in the exposition of the *Second Article*,  
OF REDEMPTION:—

*170. Who become partakers of Christ's redemption?*

They who repent and believe in Him.

*171. What benefit does the believer obtain from Christ's redemption?*

He is thereby purchased and won from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil.

*172. How, by Christ's redemption, is the believer purchased and won from sin?*

1. The guilt and punishment of sin are taken away from him.

2. Sin has no more dominion over him.

3. By a blessed death sin is wholly rooted out of him.

*173. How, by Christ's redemption, is the believer purchased and won from death?*

The spiritual death has lost its power over him, the temporal death has become to him an entrance into life, and the eternal death is no more to be feared by him.



roduced as a benefit derived from the true and living faith in Christ, and that after justification, as it is in Q. 217.<sup>1)</sup>—It is not proper to say that the believer obtains “forgiveness of sins” “*through* justification,” Q. 219,<sup>2)</sup> the two being synonymous terms.—The answer to Q. 223<sup>3)</sup> says too much and too little, and Q. 225<sup>4)</sup> with its answer is, at the very least, highly misleading.—In view of the antitheses with which we have to contend in our day within what is called the Lutheran Church, Q. 250<sup>5)</sup> should say “to forgive sins” instead of “to declare the forgiveness of sins.”—On page 126, § 31, regeneration is again described an effect of faith, after justification, while the bestowal of faith itself is the very *causa formalis* of regeneration, and only the regenerate are subjectively justified.<sup>6)</sup>—We sincerely regret

---

174. *How, by Christ's redemption, is the believer purchased and won from the power of the devil?*

The devil has no power over the believer, so long as he does not yield himself to the devil's service.

1) 217. *What benefit does a person derive from the true and living faith in Christ?*

He is thereby justified, born again, sanctified, and at last saved forever.

2) 219. *What, then, does the believer obtain through justification?*

The forgiveness of sins, and sonship with God.

3) 223. *What is regeneration, or the new birth?*

That gracious act of God's Spirit by which He makes His abode in our hearts, renews in us God's image, and thus creates a new man of God.

4) 225. *In what does that new life really consist which is created through the new birth?*

In love to God, who first loved us.

5) 250. *To whom has God given authority to declare the forgiveness of sins?*

To the ministers of the Word; but any member of the Christian Church may declare it in case of need. (Confession.)

6) 30. By this faith man is justified before God, that is, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to him, he is set free from the guilt and punishment of sin, and is regarded in Christ as if he had never sinned.

31. By the same faith he is also born again, and regains the lost image of God: in the conscience a true peace and joy, in the understanding a spiritual light, and in the will a holy desire, power, and longing.



that a book which comes forth as an addition to our English Lutheran literature for churches and schools is crippled by such serious defects, and hope that a future edition may show the effects of some orthopedic surgery. A. G.

---

**Missouri Masonic Monitor**, arranged in accordance with the work of the Grand Lodge A. F. & A. M. of Missouri. By John R. Parson, Past Grand Master. Illustrated edition. Published by John R. Parson, St. Louis, 1899. 135 pages 16mo.

The author of this little book says in the preface of the first edition: "Under the supervision of R. W. Bro. Allan McDowell, Grand Lecturer, and with the assistance of other well informed Missouri Masons, I have prepared a Monitor in exact accordance with the work of the Grand Lodge of Missouri. It contains a selection of Odes and other features which it is thought will be appreciated by the Fraternity. Hoping my work will meet with the approbation of my brethren, I offer it for their consideration." Mr. Parson is a Mason of the 33 degree, Past Grand Master of Missouri, Past Grand High Priest of Missouri, Past Grand Commander of Missouri, and Past Master Kadosh Missouri Consistory, not an ex-Mason, but a member of the Order in good and high standing, who also offers this recent edition of his book "to the Craft." The work contains forms for opening and closing, including odes, prayers, and charges; forms for the initiation of candidates for degrees, the Degree of Entered Apprentice, the Degree of Fellow Craft, the Degree of Master Mason; selected Odes; a Model for Record; a Funeral Service, prepared by Thos. E. Garrett, P. G. M., and another form of Funeral Service. Throughout the book the religion of the Lodge is exhibited, from the introductory remarks to the prayer on the last page, and we recommend the *Monitor* to all our pastors as an instructive and reliable source of information. We give a few specimens.

"Most holy and glorious Lord God, the Great Architect of the Universe, the giver of all good gifts and graces: in thy name we have assembled, and in Thy name we desire to proceed in all our doings. Grant that the sublime principles of Freemasonry may so subdue every discordant passion within us—so harmonize and enrich our hearts with Thine own love and goodness—that the Lodge at this time may humbly reflect that order and beauty which reign forever before Thy throne. Amen." P. 12.

"The Lamb has, in all ages, been deemed an emblem of innocence; he therefore, who wears the Lambskin as the badge of a Mason is constantly reminded of that purity of life and conduct which is so essentially necessary to his gaining admission into the Celestial Lodge, above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe presides." P. 29.

"By Speculative Masonry we learn to subdue the passions, act upon the square, keep a tongue of good report, maintain secrecy, and practice charity. It is so far interwoven with religion as to lay us under obligations to pay that rational homage to the Deity which at once constitutes our duty and our happiness." P. 53.

"In Youth, as Entered Apprentices, we ought industriously to occupy our minds in the attainment of useful knowledge; in Manhood, as Fellow Crafts, we should apply our knowledge to the discharge of our respective duties to God, our neighbor, and ourselves; so that in Age, as Master Masons, we may enjoy the happy reflections consequent on a well spent life, and die in the hope of a glorious immortality." P. 75.

"After our departure hence in peace, and in Thy favor, may we be received into Thine everlasting kingdom, to enjoy in union with the souls of our departed friends, the just reward of a pious and virtuous life. Amen." P. 125 f.

A. G.

---